ANGER SUPPRESSION AS A VEHICLE FOR GENDER SOCIALIZATION IN GIRLS: A DEVELOPMENTAL STUDY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

DEBORAH L. COX, M.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER, 1996

DEDICATION

For my mother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following special individuals for their contributions to my growth, both in this project and throughout my graduate study. I am deeply grateful to all the members of the psychology faculty at TWU. Emulating their guidance, instruction and diversity, I continue to struggle with the difficult questions about being human. Specifically, to the members of this dissertation committee, Dr. Roberta Nutt, Dr. Ron Palomares, and Dr. Linda Rubin, I offer sincere thanks. Their dialogue challenges and informs this work. Their characters infuse its generativity.

I am enormously and gratefully indebted to my committee chair and mentor, Dr. Sally Stabb. Our seven years' work together refines and strengthens the philosophical base upon which I build my visions for continued investigative work. Her incisiveness summons me to consider each issue from multiple perspectives. Her consistent, nonjudgmental approach to people offers a model for sustaining, collaborative relationships.

To my family and close friends, I am deeply grateful. Their support fueled much of the endurance I needed for continuing this program of study at those times when the tunnel's end seemed very dark. Their love remained constant despite the many changes in me catalyzed by this educational process. To Joe, who is both family and close friend, I owe tremendous thanks. His emotional, intellectual, and technical support contributed to the realization of a long-held dream.

ANGER SUPPRESSION AS A VEHICLE FOR

GENDER SOCIALIZATION IN GIRLS: A DEVELOPMENTAL STUDY

Deborah L. Cox

Texas Woman's University

December, 1996

A growing body of literature supports the link between anger suppression and depression, and females' greater likelihood of demonstrating both. Anger suppression has been asserted to be involved in gender socialization for girls. Differences between boys and girls in anger suppression and depression were investigated using anger stylistic and depression measures. Differences between two grade groupings in anger suppression and depression were analyzed. Results supported the hypothesis that girls suppress anger at higher rates than boys, but not the related hypothesis that such suppression relates to higher levels of depression in girls than in boys. There were no grade-group differences in either anger suppression or depression, and no significant relationship between suppressed anger and depression for either sex. However, qualitative interview data revealed girls' gender-specific behaviors and beliefs with regard to anger, including withdrawal and expectations of diminishment by significant adults .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gender socialization emerges as salient in recent descriptions of female emotional development. Feminist writers in the field of psychology reconceptualize traditional theories of development to articulate how the female's experience in an androcentric culture shapes her emerging reality and experience/expression of emotion (Bernardez, 1987; Gilligan, 1982). These writings, in conjunction with others (Brown, 1991; Gilligan, 1991) describe the relationships between females' emotional development and gender-prescriptive socialization concerning the expression of intense and (or) oppositional feelings.

Gilligan (1991) theorizes that adolescence is a time of developmental impasse for women. Just as boys are pressured in earlier childhood to emulate images of superheroes, at puberty girls become pressured to strive for images of perfection. These images involve protecting relationships at all cost, to the extent that girls must remove themselves (their own needs, wants, oppositional feelings) from the context of those important relationships. This process occurs, at least in part, due to women's "relational orientation" (Chodorow, 1978), a way of relating that reflects attunement to the feelings of others and concern about fairness. As girls enter adolescence, they may disavow any potentially conflict-laden views so as to avoid the choice between self and others (Stern, 1991).

Additionally, extensive research documents the prevalence of depression in women (Anderson & Holder, 1989; Frank, Carpenter, & Kupfer, 1988; Frankel, 1992; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990; Weissman & Klerman, 1985, 1987). The adult female-to-male ratio for experiences of unipolar depression appears as high as two-to-one (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Weissman & Klerman, 1987). Studies of childhood depression, however, show boys and girls to experience similar rates of depression before puberty (Allgood-Merten, Lewinsohn, & Hops, 1990). The prevalence of depression is assumed to increase dramatically among females somewhere between childhood and adulthood (Rutter, 1986).

Psychology often views emotion as a universal set of largely prewired internal processes of self maintenance and self regulation (Buck, 1988). Anger, as an ego-focused emotion, appears to be diagnostic of the independent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In other words, when experiencing anger, the individual notices his/her own rights, needs, or opinions and their violation or dissatisfaction (or the threat of such). In so doing, the self comes to the forefront of the individual's consciousness and some inclination to act in one's behalf becomes manifest.

Further, substantial research links depression to internalized or suppressed anger (Biaggio & Godwin, 1987; Thomas, 1989; Thomas & Atakan, 1993). In a related vein, King and Emmons (1990) report that emotional expressiveness relates positively to some measures of well-being while ambivalence about such expression relates to several indices

of psychological distress. Jones, Peacock, and Christopher (1992) find 79% of adolescents in their sample to report feeling depressed when suppressing anger.

Based on the results of a large-scale study, Harris, Blum, and Resnick (1991) find adolescent males to engage in more acting-out behaviors, such as fights, homicides and vandalism while adolescent females display symptoms indicative of internalized distress. Among the Minnesota adolescents sampled, teenaged girls report higher levels of emotional distress and make more suicide attempts than boys.

It is suggested then, that during adolescence, anger suppression forms a vehicle by which gender-specific socialization of norms for behavior are enforced. In other words, adolescent girls learn to suppress anger at higher rates than boys. As a result of suppressing anger, adolescent girls manifest the "disavowal of self" (Gilligan, 1991) theorized to protect relationships, central to girls' sense of identity. Girls are consequently expected to display more suppressed anger and symptoms indicative of internalized distress, namely depression, as compared with boys. Older adolescent females are expected to show increased levels of internalized anger as well as depression in comparison with boys of all ages and younger adolescent females.

In general, this study purports to explore ramifications of females' experience and expression of anger that relate to their overall socialization as women in a male-dominated culture. This study does not focus on heterosexuality as a criterion for inclusion in the above-named phenomenon, nor does it focus on sexual or dating relationships per se.

Rather, broad categories of girls' and women's relationships both with men and with other women and their impact on gender socialization underlie the intent of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this section, theories of emotion, developmental models, and anger models will be explored as to their relevance to girls' emotional development. First, this paper addresses traditional theories of emotion, followed by theories combining two or more traditional elements. Then, the issue of development receives focus, first by way of traditional models and then those models of development specific to emotion and affect. Following these concepts will be a discussion of gender differences in emotional development and those aspects unique to the female experience followed by an exploration of female emotional development in the context of relationships. An account of adjustment problems in adolescence rounds out the considerations of development. Finally, the construct of anger is clarified and explored in terms of historical models as well as symptomatology related to its internalization. Female anger receives special attention, preceding a summary and juxtaposition of emotional developmental models with more specific information about women's experience.

Theories of Emotion

Traditional Approaches

Biological/Evolutionary Approaches

Gray (1982) and other writers (Izard, 1991; Tomkins, 1963) suggest that emotions are the products of evolution, and that primary emotions serve biologically-adaptive functions. These notions, based on Darwin's evolutionary theory, view emotional responses as reflective of survival needs, promoting survival-related problem solving. There is basic agreement among theorists in this tradition that the structure for certain primary core emotions is wired into the human organism (Greenberg & Safran, 1989).

The differential emotions theory of Izard (cited in Cary, Finch, & Cary, 1991) proposes that certain constellations of emotions interact with cognition and situational factors, producing various affective disorders. In this view, when a particular emotion is experienced frequently and intensely, it becomes associated with other emotions nearby in the constellation, creating a mosaic or emotional pattern. When any one emotion within the pattern becomes triggered, the probability that all others within the pattern will be experienced greatly increases. According to differential emotions theory, emotions associated with depression include sadness, self-directed hostility, shame, anger, fear and guilt. Carey et al.'s (1991) review of studies in differential emotions theory supports the link between emotional patterns and depressive symptomatology. This finding parallels psychoanalytic postulates regarding sex differences in emotional development, wherein

women are expected to experience more shame, inner-directedness, passivity and masochism (Mitchell, 1974).

Smith and Lazarus (1990) elaborate on Tomkins' (1962, 1963) idea that sensory motor reflexes, physiological drives and emotions are fundamental adaptational resources for all animals, but that advanced species have evolved toward less dependence (adaptationally speaking) on innate reflexes or drives and greater dependence on emotions. Startle, pain and pleasure may best be thought of as innate reflexes versus emotions, according to Lazarus, Averil and Opton (1970). These reflexes may in fact be thought of as potential "pre-emotion" states (Lazarus, 1991) as they play a critical role in the development of the motivational structure on which emotion and appraisal are contingent. According to Lazarus, emotions constitute a distinct adaptational process from reflexes as they make possible a greater variability and flexibility of response. In essence, they facilitate the organism's learning from experience. Genetic-evolutionary theories posit that each emotion has an underlying hormonal or neural substrate with an adaptive social function. The purpose of emotion is to communicate about survival-related, approach/withdrawal processes (Plutchik, 1980).

Since the two sexes historically differed in their interpersonal survival-related functions, biological/evolutionary models hypothesize that our divergences in emotional development relate to these roles. Women, being primarily responsible for child-rearing, developed more sensitivity to nonverbal cues to help in relating to children. Men, primarily responsible for hunting and gathering food, developed less sensitivity to nonverbal cues

and either more anger or less suppression of anger than women. These qualities facilitated hunting and gathering behaviors (Brody, 1985). Strictly biological viewpoints lead to less clear predictions about differential emotional development by sex. However, some data suggest these differences exist. For example, the right cerebral hemisphere may mediate facial recognition (Ekman & Oster, 1979) as well as more spontaneous aspects of emotional behavior (Buck, 1982). The left hemisphere is associated with more cognitive, analytic aspects of emotional function. Though it is suggested that women rely more heavily on right hemisphere and men on left hemisphere processing, much related investigation yields equivocal results (Brody, 1985).

Psychodynamic Approaches

In the psychodynamic tradition, emotion became construed as psychic energy which, when accumulated in certain quantities, was then expressed. Freud conceptualized this process as one of discharge (Greenberg & Safran, 1989) associated with instinctual impulses. Therefore, emotion becomes drive-related, requiring discharge and/or taming. Freud originally viewed hysteria as a result of "strangulation" of emotion, for which catharsis was the cure.

Further, persons passively receive, rather than actively create, their emotions in Freud's later version of the "hydraulic" model, therefore, emotions become construed as precognitive in nature (Thomas, 1991). Solomon (1976) coined the term "hydraulic" referring to the idea of the human psyche as "caldron of pressures demanding their release in action or expression." Solomon further asserted Newtonian physics as the basis of the

model, employing the terms "cathexis" (filling) and "catharsis" (release/flow). Jung (1940) wrote of emotion as an "intrusion of an unconscious personality," reflecting the psychodynamic emphasis on its more aversive aspects.

Drive-based psychoanalytic approaches postulate a biological basis to emotional development maintaining that the function of emotions is to maintain intrapsychic stability in the face of conflicts which might impede biological drive satisfaction (Brenner, 1980). Since the biological anatomies of men and women differ, the development of their emotions are hypothesized to differ (Freud, 1925/1961, 1933/1965). Such differences are said to produce more passivity, shame, inner-directedness, jealousy and masochism in females and more aggression, competition, guilt and outer-directedness in males (Mitchell, 1974).

Cognitive and Behavioral Approaches

In contrast to the psychodynamic approach, behaviorism, as theory and technique: (1) focuses on affective response, and (2) proposes to eliminate "undesirable affective states," such as anxiety and depression. Two contending themes have dominated behaviorism's treatment of emotion. In the first, individuals learn emotional responses in relation to environmental contingencies (Skinner, 1953). In the second, emotions stem (at least in part) from innate propensities and dispositions (Rachman, 1978).

Cognitive-appraisal theorists such as Lazarus (1991), Roseman (1984) and Sherer (1984) take a postcognitive stance with regard to emotion. In other words, they propose that cognition precedes emotion. These theorists assert that one's interpretations of events

determine the emotions to be experienced in response, rather than the actual events per se. More will be said about Lazarus' (1991) theory in a later section. A relevant prediction made both by Sherer and by Roseman is that persons perceiving themselves as weaker or less powerful in a given situation would experience less anger than those perceiving themselves as stronger or more powerful. However, Roseman, Spindel, and Jose (1990) tested this hypotheses and found the opposite to be true, supporting the feminist notion (Miller & Surrey, 1990) that women experience anger fueled by a sense of powerlessness within the cultural context.

Cognitive-behavioral approaches, coming into prominence during the 1970's, clearly treat emotion as a postcognitive phenomenon. Beck (1976) suggested that beliefs mediate between events and emotional responses. The meaning a person attaches to an event determines the emotional response that person will experience in relation to that event (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962). Here, certain constructs explain the link between events or stimuli and emotional response, such as automatic thoughts and irrational beliefs. More recently, Berkowitz (1990) proposes a cognitive-neoassociationistic model in which higher-order appraisals and attributions either intensify or suppress initial primitive activation of anger.

Experiential/Humanistic and Existential/Phenomenological Approaches

Emotion, in experiential and humanistic circles, appears as an orienting and (or) motivating system. In contrast to traditional psychodynamic theories, experiential writers regard emotion as a valued aspect of experience, rather than something to be expelled or

discharged. Reminiscent of biological/evolutionary models, emotion expresses instinctual impulses and provides the person with adaptive information about the self in relation to the environment. Rogers (1959) defined "feeling" as a complex cognitive-affective unit composed of emotionally toned experience and its cognized meaning.

Gestalt theorists regard emotion as the organism's direct, evaluative, immediate experience of the organism/environment field, furnishing the basis of awareness of what is important to the organism for organizing action (Greenberg & Safran, 1989). One function of emotion, according to Gestalt tradition, is to balance human perception (Engle, Beutler, & Daldrup, 1991). Emotion creates the basis for awareness of what is personally relevant, mobilizing energy for action. In this way, emotion becomes the "crucial regulator of action" (p.170).

Contemporary phenomenological perspectives on emotion derive from both humanistic and Gestalt schools of thought (Greenberg & Safran, 1989). Emotions, though not woven into a comprehensive theory, are seen as fundamental to the human experience. Again, like biological/evolutionary approaches, phenomenological writers emphasize emotion's adaptive-orienting function. Yet, phenomenological theorists continue to contrast themselves with psychodynamic writers by de-emphasizing emotion's passive or pre-cognitive aspects. Robert Solomon (1976) challenged the hydraulic (passive) model in his book "The Passions." Coming from an existential/phenomenological background, Solomon viewed emotion as a basic judgment about not only our selves, but also the place

we occupy in the world. Anger involves evaluative judgments about past and present situations, concerns about the future and intentions for action.

Social Approaches

Sociological, social-learning, object-relations and cognitive-developmental theories all emphasize the importance of social context in emotional development (Brody, 1985).

Kemper's (1978) sociological theory states that emotions function to maintain or change social relationships. The power and status in a relationship determines the kind and intensity of experienced emotion, the feeling of shame resulting from a sense of being unworthy of status. Social learning theorists assert that emotions are learned associations that involve cognitive interpretations of physically-arousing situations (Lazarus, 1982). Differential emotional development for the two sexes occurs if parents socialize their sons and daughters differently through modeling of behaviors or applying different contingencies to behaviors.

According to cognitive-developmental theory, the infant's temperament (which may be genetically determined) interacts with the mother's emotional style to affect the child's ability to recognize, express, experience and cope with emotions (Piaget, 1981). These theorists also assert that the complexity of cognitive skills development relates to the complexity of emotional experiences. In other words, emotion and cognition are inextricably tied to one another by means of the child's developmental process. With development, increasing capacity in cognition facilitates increasing capacity in emotional experience.

Object relations and interpersonal perspectives view emotion as a motivational tendency that connects the organism with its environment both through action tendencies and communication (Basch, 1976). In this way, the experience of emotion becomes involved in "need satisfaction," and is socially adaptive. Emotions, according to object-relations theory, are based on attachment systems, and the threat of losing those attachments results in shame and (or) guilt, which aim to restore the attachment. Object relations theorists hypothesize that the quality of mother-infant relationship impacts a child's ability to handle intense feelings effectively, to be empathic and to self-soothe (Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983). Lewis (1985) agrees that attachment systems underlie emotions. Lewis further asserts that women are more prone to feeling shame because of their relatively low social status and their affiliative orientations which propel them toward more emotional investment in the maintenance of relationships.

Feminist revisions of the notion that attachments underlie emotion (Chodorow, 1978; Miller, 1976) emphasize women's sensitivity to nonverbal signals as a result of differential emotional development, occurring at least in part due to differences in attachment for boys and girls. Miller proposes that women's greater expression of vulnerability, self-directed hostility, weakness and helplessness results from socialization by same-sexed parents. Since girls are parented primarily by their mothers, they learn an orientation toward affective-relational issues, resulting in a lack of separateness in relation to others. Conversely, boys must clearly differentiate from mothers in order to develop separate, masculine identities. Miller's hypothesis regarding females' learning a more

vulnerable relatedness orientation involves their subordinate positions relative to men. According to Miller, this position requires of women accommodation as well as expression of more vulnerable feelings for men. More will be said in a later section about the process of women's socialization as a part of their emotional development.

Theories Combining Two or More Traditional Elements

Cognitive-Motivational-Relational Approach

Lazarus's (1991) theory of emotion includes relational, motivational and cognitive elements, combining several issues discussed thus far. Emotions are relational in that they always involve person-environment relationships that construe harms and (or) benefits to the individual. The motivational element reflects Lazarus' assertion that acute emotions or "moods" are reactions to the status of goals in everyday adaptational encounters. "Cognitive" in this model refers to knowledge and appraisal of what is happening in a person's adaptational encounters.

Lazarus (1991) discusses emotion in terms of its divergence from innate reflexes. He suggests that higher-order species evolve toward less dependence upon reflexive, physiological activities even though these processes underlie the development of emotion (e.g., startle response). Rather, human emotion becomes predicated on complex social structures and meanings, involving an adaptive appraisal process. Lazarus' (1991) contention holds that emotions are more organismic than other processes or states, (namely nonemotional or "cold" cognitions) their intensity reflecting quality of commitment to an outcome or goal.

A set of core assumptions forms the basis of Lazarus' (1991) theory. First, each emotion involves its own innate action tendency (Frijda, Kuipers, & terSchure, 1989). In anger, this is attack, but may be inhibited or transformed. Second, each emotion has its own pattern of physiological changes (Levenson, 1988). Third, the action tendency in each emotional experience provokes a psychophysiological response pattern to prepare the organism to do something relative to the person-environment relationship. In other words, without some kind of appraisal, no emotion occurs. Further, without the appraisal of a personal stake in a situation, no emotion occurs.

Primary appraisal involves the stakes one has in a particular outcome. Secondary appraisal concerns resources and options one has available for coping. This secondary appraisal process holds special significance due to its inclusion of "blame or credit" and their direction (toward oneself or another). "Other-blame" forms a core relational theme for anger with it's corresponding appraisal component, "other-accountability" (Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993). In Lazarus' (1991) view, the experience of anger depends upon appraising that the integrity of one's ego identity has been threatened by an external agent.

Lazarus (1991) asserts that blame is necessary for such emotion to occur. Anger depends on attributions that some agent is accountable and in control over the threatening action. In fact, Lazarus proposes that even in infancy or early childhood, there exists an elemental sense of goal relevance, ego identity, one's goals being at odds with the

environment, and basis for attribution or external accountability which plays a role in the experience of anger.

Secondary appraisal also includes one's coping potential and future expectations in the situation. Interdependence exists between attribution, knowledge and appraisal. Whether blame or credit becomes directed internally or externally influences one's experience of either anger, guilt, shame or pride. Future expectations influence one's coping potential (whether or not one expects things to get better or worse). In other words, having the expectation that one cannot change an unhappy situation can foster a decrease in one's coping potential (Lazarus, 1991). The model suggests that the behavioral flow between cognition and emotion goes both ways. The model allows room for the notion that emotions may begin as physiological reflexive responses in infancy and constantly grow in complexity, sophistication and breadth of evoking stimuli as the individual matures. In other words, perhaps the emotion and cognition flow goes back and forth throughout a person's emotional development. He also suggests that cognition continues into the response state (an idea that he asserts bothers those embracing the Aristotelian dictum that concept A cannot also be B). Here again, reminiscent of cognitive-developmental theory, lies the notion that cognition and emotion may represent points along a continuum, versus discreet psychological entities. Emotion being a complex state, one may consider A as cause and B as combination of action tendency, physiological change, and subjective affect (which includes the appraisal or cognitive element).

Allowing the notion of cognition continuance into the response state makes room for Lazarus' concept of coping, a concept similar to Mayer, Salovey, Gomberg-Kaufman, and Blainey's (1991) inclusion of "management-related processes" in the definition of mood. Coping represents the psychological analogue of action tendencies, a rather complex, deliberate and planful set of behaviors that follow emotion. Coping not only follows emotion, it shapes subsequent emotion, a direction of effect that Lazarus says has been underemphasized in traditional coping theory. Such a notion of coping appears to be a recursive process based on an individual's ability to self-reference, acquiring insight about one's internal and external behavior and how they are received by others.

Problem-focused coping often entails a plan of action for changing the person-environment relationship in some way, according to Lazarus' model. Emotion-focused coping attempts to alter the contents of one's mind through avoidance, denial or distancing and could be called "cognitive coping." Again, Lazarus emphasized that the driver of such coping is appraisal, as emotion is a reaction to meaning. His theory makes room for consideration of human's responses to their own emotions. Not only does he acknowledge the role of cognitions in either promoting or dampening particular emotions, he also suggests these cumulative cognition-emotion sets play a role in determining which emotional responses are experienced in the future.

Constructivist Approaches

Rosaldo (1984) contends "feelings are not substances to be discovered in our blood but social practices organized by stories that we both enact and tell. They are

structured by our forms of understanding" (p. 143). Not only does the experience of an emotion rely on a person's construal of the social situation (Frijda, Kuipers, & terSchure, 1989), but experiencing the emotion plays a pivotal role in changing the social situation. Emotional experience does this by allowing the new construal of the situation and by instigating the person to engage in some action. Thus, the approach combines cognitive, social and experiential elements.

Further, consistent with the biological/evolutionary perspective, constructivists hypothesize a neurological substrate for emotional response that is wired into the organism and includes specific configurations of expressive motor behaviors corresponding to primary emotions (fear, anger, sadness, surprise, disgust, joy). However, constructivist thinkers do not limit their formulations of human emotion to this biological substrate or the primary emotions involved in most related hypotheses. Rather, the constructivist view holds that this basic neurological template becomes further elaborated in the human being into subtle blends of emotional experience (love, pride, envy, humility, etc.). In this way, the human responds to the environment immediately, in a reflexive fashion, making immediate perceptual-motor appraisals related to biological and psychological survival. These judgments (reminiscent of Lazarus' model above) are constantly subjected to ongoing conceptual appraisal as they occur. This constant appraisal process increases in sophistication as the organism matures and develops memory stores consisting of images of environmental stimuli, evoked motor responses, autonomic arousal responses and conceptual appraisals.

In this way, emotional experience "becomes coded in memory structures or networks that incorporate components from expressive, motor, schematic, and conceptual levels of the information processing system (Leventhal, 1982, p. 23). When a person attends to or generates information that matches one of the components of the network, other associated components likely become activated. An emotion prototype or network as Lang (1983) termed it, automatically activates when an individual attends to stimuli matching sufficient coded information in the prototype. The experience of emotion thus reflects the activation of a cognitive-affective network.

As in Lazarus' (1991) cognitive-motivational-relational model, emotional experience in the constructivist approach becomes complicated by ongoing learning and assessment. People may then modify not only behavioral manifestation but also more direct experiences of feelings as well. Emotion prototypes or networks may involve complex information processing wherein social context enhances or diminishes one's experience. Further, an emotion prototype could involve expectations for outcomes in an emotion-eliciting situation, including interpersonal ones.

To summarize, an overview of both traditional and more recent approaches to emotion reveals trends in conceptualization as well as prompts questions and further integration. Biological-evolutionary approaches focus attention on the adaptive nature of emotional experience for enhancing survival of the organism. Psychoanalytic models emphasize the natural-occurrence of human emotion and a necessity for overt release. Cognitive and behavioral approaches bring beliefs into prominence as a mediator between

events and emotional response, leaning heavily upon beliefs, thoughts and opinions as central and necessary for emotional response. Experiential, humanistic, and existential/phenomenological thinkers hold emotion itself as the central axis for experience of all types. These approaches insist on the active human in creating, sustaining, and using the emotional experience for survival-related functioning. Finally, social approaches highlight the importance of primary relationships not only in the early formation of emotional foundations but in the ongoing development and (or) maintenance of characteristic affective responses.

The cognitive-motivational-relational approach of Lazarus (1991) combines aspects of each traditional model to conceptualize emotion as a complex, interactive process. He incorporates notions about the mediation of beliefs between events and emotion, the latter as a motivating element, and social relationships as central to the experience of emotion. This treatment highlights the ongoing shaping of emotional phenomena according to what is needed by the individual at a given point in time.

To further clarify what is implied thus far in an integration of these models, the concept of mood illustrates a broader phenomenon than strict emotional content alone (Mayer et al., 1991). Mood provides a general context for thought and a "tuning" of the organism, consisting of multiple, dynamic dispositions and attitudes, some of which are cognitive. Mood experience includes emotions such as happiness, sadness, anger, and fear, as well as physical sensations associated with them (sweaty palms, upset stomach, etc.). Mood experience may also encompass "management"-related processes that modify

perceptions of the eliciting stimuli themselves (Mayer & Gaschke, 1988). These processes include the experiences of suppression (e.g., "don't think about it") and (or) behavioral planning (e.g., "get help"). According to Mayer et al. (1991), emotion management cannot be separated from emotional process. Therefore, "mood" encompasses not only physiological and cognitive aspects of emotional experience, but meta-processing and more overt behavioral expression as well.

The James-Lange theory of emotion (James, 1890) and Schacter and Singer's (1962) two-factor model both distinguish between physiological arousal and cognitive appraisal, thereby allowing for a broader conception of emotion. They each view emotion as a third type of experience: a product of the interaction between physiological and cognitive activity, not unlike more recent descriptions of mood. Mayer et al.'s (1991) notion of "management-processes" within the broader concept of mood allows for understanding of some key concepts in emotional development. Such notions tie closely together with cognitive-appraisal theory, emphasizing the interaction of more primary emotional response with the overlay of one's learning about emotional response.

So, to view emotion as more complex than simple physiological arousal ushers in the possibility of the close relatedness of cognition with emotion. This concept brings with it the possibility that both thought and feeling continuously affect each other, in something of a recursive process. Therefore, continued learning and development result in acquired governing of one's feeling states as well as one's attached beliefs and behavioral

tendencies. Taken in gestalt, these intertwined processes make up a general context for the "tuning of the organism."

Constructivism takes the issue a step further, proposing that shaped emotional experiences actually alter the social context in which they emerge. Thus, a circularity develops between feeling, social reality, and behavioral/affective manifestation. Expectations for outcomes help to determine future emotional experiences. Emotion management processes affect and become affected by dominant social constructions which serve to augment or diminish their experience.

Understanding an integration of these models holds particular importance for a study of female emotional development. As will be outlined later, social forces which affect the developing girl's thoughts about her intense emotions may influence not only her expression of those feelings but her experience of them as well, perhaps via emotion-management processes. These processes in turn, may influence the larger social surround in which they take place, reinforcing societal notions about femininity. The following discussion of development further clarifies this idea.

Development

Traditional Developmental Models

Erikson (1968) proposed the goal of healthy development to be autonomy. Childhood consists of a series of stages, each bringing the developing organism closer to differentiation, or behavior reflective of the separation of self and others. The primary developmental task of adolescence becomes acquisition of a separate identity. However,

for females, Erikson's theory suggests a certain passive or less self-defining nature that is biologically inherent. Erikson wrote that females' identity development depends upon leaving itself only partially defined for the sake of marriagability. In this way, he thought females were more adaptable to the characteristics of their future husbands and children. Therefore, a little girl was "more easily content within a limited circle of activities and shows less resistance to control . . ." (p. 281).

Thus, in Erikson's widely-accepted theory, there exists a valuing of independence and disconnection as goals for healthy development sitting alongside an argument against such for women. Further, less "resistance to control" appears to be a large component of female differential emotional development in Erikson's view. This apparent passivity or lack of resistance may parallel the suppression of anger as low levels of assertiveness in women have been linked to anger suppression (Delamater & McNamara, 1987).

Kohlberg's (1981) theory of moral development also appears to uphold independence as a marker of health, viewing autonomous evaluation as the pinnacle of maturity in moral decision-making. The more-developed person uses " . . .free-standing logic of equality and reciprocity" (p. 27) in reflecting on societal values and arriving at conclusions. Even phenomenological theories such as those put forth by Maslow (1954) and Rogers (1959) suggest autonomy to be fundamental in development. Rogers asserts that healthy individuals rely on their own internal processes rather than other people's feelings or opinions. Maslow's concept of self actualization relies on the development of internal mechanisms for growth, versus more interdependence with people.

Thus, a contradiction emerges in the traditional models of development. While independence and autonomous thought/feeling processes are valued by key theorists, their application to women appears openly limited. Yet, no attempt is made in these traditional theories to rectify the situation by either proposing an alternative model for women or showing a need for balanced levels of both connectedness and autonomy in men as well as women. More will be said in a later section on augmentations to the traditional picture of development which yield insight into particulars of female experience.

Developmental Models Specific to Emotion/Affect

As typically conceived, three dimensions comprise the emotion system (Izard, 1978): the physiological, behavioral or expressive, and experiential or subjective. Developmental changes theoretically take place in all three areas. Much change occurs in infancy and early childhood. Early on, emotional responses are elicited almost exclusively by physical stimuli, the band of elicitors gradually increasing to more abstract stimuli. Brody (1985) suggests that emotional development as a construct includes such components as physiological/experiential (heart rate), cognitive (interpretation), behavioral/expressive (facial expression), attitudinal (values placed on the experience), and regulatory (coping and defense mechanisms).

These regulatory mechanisms parallel Lazarus' (1991) concept of "coping," and Mayer et al.'s (1991) concept of "management-related" processes regarding mood. The constructs of regulatory processes, management-related processes, and coping all reflect the notion that one's experience of emotion is more complex than simply a "feeling state."

Such constructs suggest the presence of an overlay of processes aimed at mitigating any social and (or) psychological consequences of intense emotional experience.

Though much debate exists regarding the nature of emotional development as well as the importance of gender differences in emotional development, theorists tend to concur with the following trends (Brody, 1985):

(1) A biological preparedness for emotional expressiveness (and implicitly, experiences) exists at birth.

(2) This preparedness seems to take the form of either general arousal or discreet emotional states (anger versus sadness), playing a significant part in infant-caretaker interactions and the development of cognitive skills or motivation.

(3) As individuals develop, their experience and expression of emotion becomes more differentiated, stable and both internally and externally regulated.

(4) Expression of emotion becomes increasingly subject to voluntary controls as individuals become more aware of social acceptability with development.

(5) Each emotion becomes elicited by or associated with an increasing number of different situations.

From a dialectical point of view, emotion is best understood within a social and developmental context. Izard's (1991) differential emotions theory proposes that the experiential component of emotion becomes governed by feedback of the facial musculature. This theory suggests that with increasing age, children learn to moderate overt expression of feelings in response to socialization pressures and norms. The theory

does not indicate a corresponding decrement in actual emotional feeling experienced with age. Differential emotions theory further focuses on the emotional system as the primary motivating system in humans throughout the life span.

Gender Differences in Emotional Development

The assumption of gender differences in emotional development has been used to explain various phenomena associated with psychological functioning (Brody, 1985). Data indicate that with development, boys increasingly inhibit expression of most emotions while girls increasingly inhibit expression and recognition of "socially unacceptable" emotions such as anger. By adulthood, there are gender differences in many of the components of emotion. These differences may help to account for males' and females' divergences in mood, cognitive style, motivation, self concept, and problems like depression.

Brody (1985) writes that gender differences in emotional development result partially from the qualitatively different exchanges made between parents/caretakers and their sons versus daughters. Some evidence seems to point to intentional or conscious differences in parenting practices with boys versus girls. Other evidence suggests less overt, more unconscious processes at work in gender socialization through parenting. A similar process manifests in the classroom as teachers have been shown to call on boys more than girls. Girls receive more attention than boys only in the area of appearance, both in terms of their physical beauty or the neatness of their schoolwork (AAUW, 1991; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Early work by Block (1973) suggests that parents encourage sons toward aggression with non-emotionality, while they encourage daughters toward emotionality with non-aggression. Reflective of this idea, studies done in the early 1980's show mothers responding more consistently and imitatively to sons' anger displays than to daughters' (Kendrick & Dunn, 1983; Malatesta & Haviland, 1982). Birnbaum and Croll (1984) report that parents show more acceptance of anger in boys than in girls, with greater acceptance of fear in girls than in boys. Correspondingly, and echoing Izard's (1991) theorizing on facial musculature feedback as a component in the development of affect regulation, girls have been shown to mask facial expressions of anger more often than boys when presented with anger-provoking vignettes (Underwood, Coie, & Herbsman, 1992).

Evidence for innate differences is found in Haviland and Malatesta's (1981) review of studies indicating that at birth, boys appear more irritable, startle more easily and cry more intensely than girls. Cunningham and Shapiro (1984, cited in Brody 1985) found that even when raters were blind to the sex of a child, boys were found to produce more frequent anger, less frequent sadness, and more intense expression of all emotions in general than girls. Conversely, an early study by Goodenough (1931) reported angry outbursts to be more frequent among girls than boys until two years of age, at which time girls' angry expressions sharply decreased.

Infant girls have been found to be more interested in mother-child interactions than infant boys (Malatesta & Haviland, 1982). Girls exhibit stranger- and separation-anxiety at earlier ages than boys (Kagan, 1978). Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, and Archer

(1979) report that as early as third grade, females show superior recognition skills, are better at judging negative emotions, and profit more from the presence of body cues - relative to males. Additionally, females become increasingly sensitive to the social consequences ensuing from decoding cues which the communicator does not intentionally wish to convey (Blanck, Rosenthal, Snodgrass, DePaulo, & Zuckerman, 1981).

In terms of experience of emotion or affect, psychodynamic theories predict girls to show less anger and guilt, and more vulnerability, shame, helplessness, and depression than boys. However, Hoffman (1975) found girls more likely to attribute guilt to same sex story characters than boys, with girls developing a stronger tendency toward guilt with age. The apparent contradiction between psychodynamic theory and these results suggests a need for clarification of the use of "guilt" as a construct. "Shame" may be more descriptive of women's emotional development as it involves notions about the self and could reflect societal attitudes toward women as subordinate to men.

Microsoft Encarta (1994) defines guilt as "the fact of being responsible for the commission of an offense, or remorseful awareness of having done something wrong." Their definition of shame reads "a painful emotion caused by a strong sense of guilt, embarrassment, unworthiness, or disgrace." The key difference between the definitions seems to lie in their emphasis on the factual state of having done something (in the case of guilt) versus the feeling state (in the case of shame). One appears tied to awareness of the commission of an act while the other connotes a general negativity directed inward to the

self. Nonetheless, predictions that girls experience more vulnerability, shame, helplessness, envy and self-directed hostility have received little actual empirical study (Brody, 1985).

The most consistent data about gender differences in emotional functioning independent of developmental timetable or etiology come from studies about emotional sex role stereotypes as well as self-report, interview, and self-attribution studies. These tend to show females stereotyped to be and self-reportedly more sad, scared and emotionally expressive while less angry than males (Brody, 1985).

Problems abound in the research on gender differences in emotional development and functioning. Traditional studies investigating gender differences in emotional development have most often measured expressiveness through raters' judgments either: (a) after subjects have been induced to experience a certain emotion, or (b) during naturalistic observation. Judges are frequently asked to compare the facial expressions of boys and girls without being blind to the sex of the child. Researchers in these contexts may actually be measuring how judges perceive boys and girls, rather than subjects' actual differential expression.

Second, there exists a lack of emphasis on the context in which emotion occurs in research on gender differences in emotionality. This problem may be especially significant as very different precipitants have been found to elicit anger in males than in females (Frodi, MacCaulley, & Thome, 1977). Further, the same emotional expression may have different meanings for each sex (Brody, 1985).

Therefore, using developmental models to better understand emotion, it appears that human emotional experience may take at least two different forms, depending upon the developmental level of the individual. Emotion in infancy seems to begin as a primarily precognitive phenomenon, influenced by innate needs and responses to caregivers. With maturity, however, human emotion becomes increasingly subject to influence by the wider social context and by learning about the consequences of manifest emotionality. In this way, perhaps emotion becomes more postcognitive in nature, reflecting its permeability to significant social relationships and the need of the developing organism for endorsement via such relationships.

Female Emotional Development

Predictions about female emotional development derived from the previously-discussed theories of emotion include the following. According to psychoanalytic, sociological and genetic/evolutionary theories, females should experience less anger and guilt than do males. According to feminist psychoanalytic, drive-based psychoanalytic, object-relations and sociological theories, females should experience more self-directed hostility, envy, shame, depression, vulnerability, helplessness and anxiety than do males. According to psychoanalytic theories, females should direct feelings internally versus externally. Biological-evolutionary theories predict females should be more sensitive to nonverbal cues than males. Certain feminist and psychoanalytic theories suggest girls and women should be more expressive in general than boys and men.

Object-relations theory provides a possible explanatory framework for tying the above-listed viewpoints together and clarifying apparent contradictions in their integration. Lewis (1983) argues that the attachment basis of emotion predisposes women to experience more shame, and men more guilt. She asserts that (1) women's low sociocultural status causes them to feel inferior, predisposing them to experience more shame (internalizing others' negative views of them); and (2) due to women's more affiliative orientations, shame is more easily induced in them than it is in men. In other words, women experience more negative feelings about themselves because of the emphasis they place on others' approval or disapproval. Further, since girls are parented primarily by their mothers, they learn an orientation toward affective-relational issues, resulting in a lack of separateness in relation to others. Conversely, boys must clearly differentiate from mothers in order to develop separate masculine identities.

Therefore, each traditional theory's predictions about female emotional development contributes a piece of the overall picture. If girls are socialized towards affective-relational orientations, others' feelings in general take on increased significance for them in comparison to boys. If others' feelings include low status appraisals for females, these too become internalized by the developing woman. Females may experience more overall self-directed negative emotion, as predicted by psychoanalytic, object-relations, sociological, feminist and feminist-psychoanalytic theories. Females may also be more expressive of emotion, as predicted by certain feminist and psychoanalytic theories, but probably restrict this expression to those feelings that are socially sanctioned for

women or perceived as relationship enhancing. Further, if females experience more shame, helplessness, vulnerability and anxiety due to their low social status, likelihood of their expressing emotions like anger, which may be more self-protecting and self-interested yet perceived as less relationship-enhancing, decreases sharply (Brody, 1985).

Feminist writers have fairly recently begun to assert that traditional theories of emotional development fail to address the unique situations faced by female children growing up in a patriarchal culture (Brown & Gilligan, 1992, 1993). In fact, gender socialization has been theorized to greatly impact emotional development. Gilligan (1982) and others (Bernardez, 1988; Brown, 1991) describe the interaction between female emotional development and gender-specific ideals which become translated into expectations for behavior.

As boys become pressured to emulate hero-images in early childhood, Gilligan (1991) hypothesizes that girls become pressured in adolescence to take on images of "perfection" as goals for becoming. The "perfect" female in gender socialization mythology is completely empathic and agreeable, one whom "everybody will promote and value and want to be with" (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, 1990). Brown (1995) writes about this female standard against which others are measured. She describes this image as recognizable to anyone who opens the pages of a typical teen fashion magazine: beautiful, tall, long hair, perfect skin, pretty eyes, nice figure, talented, obtaining good grades, having a personality to match her looks, humble, nice, and loyal. Brown makes reference to the regulatory power this "phantasmic ideal" (Butler, 1991, p. 21) wields

among groups of girls, even though they know of no girls who can perfectly emulate her. She further writes of idealized femininity as endorsing "silence over outspokenness, passivity over active resistance, a pleasing ignorance over knowledge of the complexity and difficulty of lived experience and relationships, weakness over physical strength and aggressiveness" (Brown, 1995, p. 13).

Further, Gilligan (1991) writes that in order to achieve this goal of feminine perfection, girls must resist knowing what is happening in a given moment. In other words, girls must learn to censor the incoming information to which they attend. Stern (1991) suggests that some girls who demonstrate a solid sense of self in pre-adolescence, begin to devalue their perceptions, beliefs, thoughts and feelings during adolescence. This disavowal of self, while allowing for the relational aspects of socialization to occur, also relates to psychological symptomatology including eating disorders and depression (Jack, 1987, 1991; Steiner-Adair, 1986).

Psychoanalytic theorist Karen Horney (1926) linked this devaluation phenomenon to dysphoric feelings which correspond with a woman's adoption of male-defined values and goals. Other early writers (Deutsch, 1944; Thompson, 1942) noted female adolescents' shutting down or repressing affect, but conceptualized this in terms of female passivity or masochism, as theorized by Freud. Although this perspective has been criticized as endorsing a view of traditional masculinity as the norm for all human behavior, their observances of girls coincide with observations made by contemporary researchers. Brown (1989), Gilligan (1984), and Rogers and Gilligan (1988) all report

decrements in self-confidence among girls aged eleven to fifteen that goes "beyond the usual adolescent uncertainty and questioning to indicate a deeper conflict about the validity of what they were experiencing and seeing" (Gilligan, 1984).

Female Emotional Development in the Context of Relationships

Certain theorists emphasize the self as fundamental to relationships (Erikson, 1963) while others emphasize relationships as central to the self (Kohut, 1971). The so-called Western notion of self as independent, self-contained, and autonomous relies heavily on internal attributes for explaining human behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This view becomes mirrored in much traditional developmental theory as well. As mentioned earlier, Erikson's (1963) view held that adolescent development involves detachment from relationship, thereby placing the self in opposition to the relationship. Such a view is considered by female developmental and adolescent developmental theorists to be particularly inaccurate for women (Stern, 1991). The emphasis on detachment, however, reflects the larger cultural bias in favor of male-defined norms for emotional development. Markus and Kitayama (1991) compare an independent view of the self with a very different interdependent view, asserting the former to reflect a monocultural, Western, middle-class, male bias. They suggest traditional Western notions of the self as detached from its context to be simply inadequate for describing women.

As previously discussed, theory and research in women's emotional development strongly suggests that females acquire a "relational orientation" versus a more individual orientation. Jean Baker Miller (1976) put forth a new theory of women's development

called "self-in-relation," having as its premise that all humans begin life as a self connected to a primary caregiver and sensitive to this person's emotional state. Miller asserts that though all infants begin life this way, women continue as primarily relational, due in large part to gender socialization. Thus, a discussion of women's emotional development "in relationships" makes sense in terms of gender socialization. Women's emotional experience and expression in the context of significant relationships represent important components in their overall development. Since an awareness of and sensitivity to others is paramount to the psychology of women, it follows that self esteem depends on fostering and sustaining relationships as well as other, more independent markers of success (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Gilligan's (1991) qualitative study of adolescent girls yields insight into a relational crisis faced by girls as they enter adolescence. She calls this crisis an "impasse" in development, wherein for the sake of important connections with others, girls must remove themselves from those very relationships in certain significant ways. Girls begin to feel the conflict between the necessity of relating and the necessity of personal feeling (particularly individualistic or oppositional feeling). Therefore, some compromise must be created. Eleven or twelve year old girls are said to speak with clarity of knowing and seeing, based on their use of personal judgment (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hammer, 1990). Adolescence brings about new rules, wherein girls must maintain relationship by denial of self information.

Compared with boys, whose desire for relationship tends to be less articulated and more associated with early terror and loss, girls' desire for relationship takes on a much different flavor (Gilligan, 1991). Following years of experience with the complexity of deeply-connected friendships, girls' desire for relationship remains less contaminated, more resistant to the hardships faced as they approach adolescence. Thus, as girls approach adolescence, and a dominant culture of relating that favors separation as the optimal dynamic for individuation, they must resist the expected disconnection. This resistance forces a sort of double-bind, requiring the girl to remove certain aspects of herself from relationships, a compromise designed to protect such connections with people.

Brown (1991) considers this necessary compromise to take the form of a "giving over" of one's thoughts and feelings. Stern (1991) suggests that viewing the female self as completely congruent with its relationships highlights a problem inherent in the process. Ironically, "viewing the self as completely able to absorb the agendas of others becomes the mirror image of seeing the self as completely outside of relationships" (p. 113). Stern seems to be saying that denying one's own agendas by solely focusing on others' actually keeps one outside the interactions of a relationship which would be made possible by a more self-interested engagement with the other. Recent empirical evidence using a scale based on Jack's (1987, 1991) "silencing the self" theory seems to support this notion. Thompson and Hart (1996) report women who score higher on the Silencing the Self

Scale (Jack, 1991) to correspondingly experience decreased intimacy, insecure attachment patterns, and depressive symptomatology.

By disavowing the self, a girl attempts to avoid the choice between self and others. Denying her conflict-laden feelings helps her avoid criticism or attack she's certain would follow their revelation. To disregard or devalue one's experiences allows a girl to avoid jeopardizing those sacred connections, so familiar from earlier childhood. They also allow her to strive toward gender prescriptive images of the perfect female, with which she's inundated.

Adjustment Problems in Adolescence

Research indicates adolescence is a time of great psychological danger for girls (Petersen, 1988). As mentioned earlier in this paper, studies of childhood depression show boys and girls to experience similar rates of depression before puberty (Allgood-Merten et al., 1990). However, compared with boys, adolescent girls manifest more depression and poorer emotional well-being (Ebata, 1987, cited in Stern, 1991; Rutter, 1986), more negative self appraisal (Grove & Herb, 1974; Kandel & Davies, 1982) and more likely experience their first psychological disturbances (Ebata, 1987, cited in Stern, 1991). Often, these disturbances continue into adulthood, developing into more serious problems later in life (Rutter, 1980).

The American Association of University Women (AAUW, 1991) conducted a survey which polled 3,000 boys and girls nationwide on their attitudes toward self, school, family and friends. The students, spanning ages nine to fifteen, were asked to provide

comments and were interviewed in focus groups in some cases. Results showed passage into adolescence to be a treacherous time for girls, marked by loss of confidence in self and abilities (especially in the areas of math and science). Adolescence brings a highly critical attitude among girls toward their own bodies and overwhelming sense of personal inadequacy. Teenaged girls reported much more vulnerability to depression and hopeless feelings than boys, being four times more likely to attempt suicide. They experienced a reduction in their expectations for success and a self-censorship of their creative and intellectual potentials.

Further, the AAUW (1991) study found gender bias in the classrooms of adolescents, where both boys and girls believed teachers to encourage more assertive behavior in boys, who also received more teacher attention in general. Girls' interest and achievement in math and science drops precipitously during these years, but researchers have long known that loss of confidence in math precedes a drop in achievement, rather than vice versa (Kloosterman, 1990).

The AAUW (1991) survey also reported an interesting variation among ethnic groups in the loss of self esteem. Although all girls report consistently lower self esteem than boys, more African American girls retain their overall self esteem during adolescence than white or Latina girls, with a corresponding sense of personal and familial importance.

In a large-scale study of Minnesota adolescents, Harris, Blum and Resnick (1991) found females to display a picture of "quiet disturbance." While boys acted out in the form of fighting, vandalism, and substance abuse, girls tended to internalize distress. The female

adolescents in this study reported significantly more negative body image, chronic dieting, and bulimic behavior than boys. This difference tended to widen with the age of the adolescents. Girls in this study reported more emotional stress, depression, and suicidality than the boys. Following seventh grade, twice as many female as male Minnesota youths attempted suicide. Further, Harris and colleagues found far more teen females to report physical and (or) sexual abuse in their histories than their male counterparts, a substantial number having never discussed the abuse with anyone.

These findings parallel those of many other studies on gender differences in adolescent psychological well-being (Earls, 1987; Gjinde, Block & Block, 1988; Seiden, 1989). Across a variety of populations studied, females tend towards internalized expressions of distress and loss of self-efficacy feelings versus more externalized symptoms. Further, Harris et al. (1991) assert that these differences reflect gender socialization from an early age. However, they point out that characterizing adolescent females as more prone to internalizing stress may be an oversimplification of the issue.

Focusing on self-esteem as a marker in gender socialization, Orenstein (1994) writes that girls with a healthy self-esteem feel a sense of entitlement, a right to occupy space in the world and to be heard, expressing a full spectrum of human emotions. On the flip-side of the emotional development coin, Brown (1994) writes about how girls must deal with inherent contradictions in middle-class notions of femininity, and how these contradictions undermine their strong feelings, particularly feelings of anger. She further asserts that this struggle to handle the inconsistencies in expected feminine behavior

contribute to girls' disconnection from themselves and (or) public life. Brown's (1994) qualitative study of adolescent girls uncovers the issue of class as endemic to this struggle as working class girls display more intense and sustained, less hidden or disguised forms of anger. She notes, however, that like middle class girls, these girls choose, at times, to suppress strong feelings apparently because of the potential for ruining supportive relationships.

Gilligan (1990) asserts that for girls to remain responsive to themselves, they must resist the conventions of feminine goodness; to remain responsive to others, they must resist the values placed on self-sufficiency and independence. Presented with this dilemma, choices of either appearing selfish or selfless, many silence their distinctive voices. They appear less-confident, more tentative, punctuating their speech with "I don't knows" rather than firm declarations of opinion.

In summary, viewing emotional development through a gender-specific lens generates insight into the particular dilemmas faced by females. Emotional development becomes further elaborated by: (1) women's more relational orientation, and (2) gender socialization messages involving "perfection" as the ultimate goal for becoming. A large portion of female emotional development centers around close interpersonal relationships and more attunement to the needs and feelings of others. Also, girls become heavily influenced by societal messages suggesting a form of feminine ideal. This image involves, among other attributes, a passivity receiving value and reinforcement over forms of resistance which would conversely involve expression of divergent or angry feelings.

These dilemmas, dramatically played out in adolescence, emerge in the form of a suppressed or silenced self. Both in literal expression of opinion or intense feeling and symbolically, in terms of covert self-disavowal, girls learn to diminish themselves as a way of protecting valued connections with others, living up to the ideal image given them by gender socialization norms. Correspondingly, girls experience more depression and other forms of internalized distress and self-abnegation upon entering adolescence than their male counterparts.

Using the foregoing conclusions, together with insights generated through traditional developmental models, it is argued that with maturity, girls learn to suppress strong or oppositional feelings via reinforcement/feedback by significant others and society at large. As girls develop increased capacity to monitor their emotional experience and (or) expression, they increasingly silence themselves, resulting in reduced feelings of self-efficacy or self worth. Depressive or other symptomatology indicative of internalized distress may tend to manifest in girls who demonstrate this cumulative and selective "control" over emotional expressiveness.

Anger Models

Derived from the Latin word "angere," meaning "to strangle," or "a strong feeling of displeasure about one's throat, anger has been identified as one of the primary human emotions (Thomas, 1991). Control of this emotion has been a topic of practical and theoretical argument in Western culture for centuries, with hostility towards anger constituting a theme throughout history (Kemp & Strongman, 1995). Restraint of this

emotion meant the person was sane or civilized (Thomas, 1990) as for many centuries, anger was considered a sin, weakness, or sign of mental disturbance. Solomon Schimmel's (1979) account of anger's place in Graeco-Roman and modern psychology reveals general attitudes regarding anger as a negative force, or something undesirable to be controlled. Yet even the classicists defined anger in terms of its informational nature: " . . .a passion aroused in a person when he [sic] suffers a slight or an injury or perceives himself to have suffered one, and which directs his actions toward punishment of the real or perceived offender" (p.322). This summary of Aristotle's, Plutarch's, and Seneca's definitions reveals not only anger's informative value but its motivational function as well.

Moving forward to modern psychology, Freud's (1921/1946) dual-instinct theory held that the life instinct (encompassing sexual drive) sought to perpetuate life, while the death instinct (encompassing aggression) sought to return to inorganic matter. Aggressiveness was a way to combat anxiety by deflecting death instinct energy away from the self. This writing led other psychoanalytically trained therapists to suggest catharsis for management of anger. Thus, anger in the psychoanalytic tradition not only accumulates as an energy requiring release but protectively facilitates the individual's flight from potential harms of the death instinct.

In the 1930's, the frustration-aggression hypothesis was advanced (Thomas, 1990) in which anger became viewed as a response to a blocked goal. The Skinnerian behavioral conceptualization holds that anger, like other emotions, becomes a learned response to environmental stimuli (Skinner, 1953). Modern cognitive and cognitive-behavioral

theorists emphasize thought in their formulations on anger. Novaco (1985) writes of anger as an "emotional state defined by the presence of physiological arousal and cognitions of antagonism" (p. 210). This view reflects the writings of Seneca, more than 2,000 years ago, who essentially described anger as a cognitively mediated process, "an agitation of the mind that proceeds to the resolution of a revenge, the mind assenting to it" (cited in Thomas, 1990, p. 208). Although such a view brings cognitions into a causative position relative to anger, it continues the theme of anger as self-preservation by acknowledging its connection to a personal goal or stake in the situation.

Again, with cognition as a central theme, Beck's (1976) ideas about anger involve assault on one's domain or moral code. Anger responses become based on appraisals of reality. Notions such as Beck's on anger as something of an alarm system highlight its importance to maintaining the integrity of the self. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Markus and Kitayama (1991) suggest that anger derives from and promotes an independent view of the self. These writers further assert that anger may be less prevalent, or less overtly expressed in those with interdependent selves and other-serving motives. Izard's (1991) discourse presents a list of causes of anger: restraint, the blocking or interrupting of goal-directed activity, aversive stimulation, being misled or unjustly hurt, and moral indignations. Izard further describes the emotion as an adaptive state which interacts with disgust and contempt, mobilizing energy for defense.

Sullivan (1953) was perhaps the first to emphasize anger's interpersonal nature. He suggested individuals have expectations of others, which when unmet, produce anxiety.

Anger, allowing for increased feelings of empowerment, functions to relieve this anxiety. Solomon (1976) similarly wrote of anger as a judgment of personal offense. A person becomes displeased because of unmet expectations, seeking to punish the offender. Averill's (1983) research supports this social perspective finding anger to occur most often between friends and loved ones, precipitated by some perceived wrongdoing.

Emphasizing the context of anger, Tavris (1989) asserts that most angry episodes are social events wherein the assumed meaning occurs between antagonists. Similarly emphasizing the causes of anger, Scherer, Wallbott and Summerfield (1986) report on their cross-cultural analysis. These investigations list the following as antecedents of anger: the failure of friends, the failure of strangers, inappropriate rewards, the failure of relatives, inconvenience, and the failure to reach goals. Markus and Kitayama (1991) write that Americans and Western Europeans report experiencing anger primarily in the context of close personal relationships. Further, experiencing and expressing anger, an ego-focused emotion, allows a person to assert and affirm the status of self as independent entity. Therefore, anger in the context of relationships serves to remind parties of their individual rights, integrities, and opinions.

Relative to the concept of anger as a social phenomenon, Averill (1982) notes that anger and aggression are often directed at inferiors. Furthermore, if one has power, anger helps one keep it by fortification of one's position. To contrast, Averill further suggests that the anger that results from powerlessness in Western society is viewed as more out of

control, more passionate, and more ineffectual. Anger's expression often meets with provocation of the empowering type of anger in return.

Crawford, Kippax, Onyx, Gault, and Benton (1992) offer one of the few existing feminist analyses of emotion, arguing that anger involves judgments about rightness and wrongness, but is also related to fear. Connected with being hurt, anger in these writers' view is disallowed for women, as evidenced by the common ridicule or teasing of women for its expression. For women, Crawford et al. argue, tears often demonstrate the strength of the anger, giving testimony to feelings of being victimized, annoyed, or aggrieved. Yet tears are often pathologized in women as "out of control." Crawford et al. assert that women's suppression does not control their anger but only renders the emotion more extreme.

Internalization of Anger and Symptomatology

Much current research focuses on the effects of anger suppression, both in terms of psychological and physiological or somatic processes. Suppressed anger has been found to correlate with hypertension (Cottington, Matthews, Talbott, & Kuller, 1986; Mills & Dimsdale, 1993); myocardial infarction (Spicer, Jackson, & Scragg, 1993); atherosclerosis (Tennant & Langeluddecke, 1985); and colorectal cancer (Kune, G., Kune, S., Watson, & Bahnson, 1991). The relationship between such disorders and suppression of anger appears to involve certain biological concomitants of stress, namely increased autonomic arousal, endocrine, and immunological responses (Greer & Watson, 1985).

By far the most widely studied psychological disturbance in relation to anger suppression is depression. Substantial research supports the connection between simply the feeling of anger and experience of depression. Thomas and Atakan (1993) report such a relationship among the 535 women they sampled. Sperberg (1992) also reports a direct relationship between depression scores and anger in her nonclinical sample of women. Suppression of anger relates to the experience of depression as well (Goldman & Haaga, 1995; Tschannen, Duckro, Margolis, & Tomazic, 1992). In fact, depressive symptomatology is stated to be the result of a psychological process of internalizing anger (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983).

Thomas (1989) states that suppressed anger is widely held to be a factor in women's depression. Beutler, Engle, Oro'-Beutler, Daldrup, and Meredith (1986) suggest that inability to express intense affect of all kinds manifests in chronic pain and depression. Jones, Peacock, and Christopher (1992) conducted a qualitative study of adolescents and found that 79% of their sample felt depressed when they did not express their anger. Culkin and Perotto (1985) also found inhibited verbal expression, particularly affectively charged expression, to be an index of depression.

Across a wide variety of sources, women more likely experience depression than men (Anderson & Holder, 1989; Frank, Carpenter, & Kupfer, 1988; Frankel, 1992; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Weissman & Klerman, 1985, 1987). In fact, the female-to-male ratio of occurrence of unipolar depressive episodes is two-to-one (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Weissman & Klerman, 1987).

Women clearly predominate among depressed young adults (Lewiston, Duncan, Stanton, & Hautzinger, 1986). However, studies on childhood depression reveal a different pattern among pre-adolescent children. Girls do not appear to predominate among the depressed very early in the lifespan (Weissman & Klerman, 1977).

Comparatively little is known about adolescent depression (Allgood-Merten et al., 1990), but the growing literature on the topic suggests that adolescents are substantially more depressed than children (Angold, 1988) and may be more depressed than adults (Garrison, Shoenbach, & Kaplan, 1984). Again, like adult populations studied, adolescent females report more depressive symptoms, self-consciousness, negative body image and self-esteem than adolescent males (Allgood-Merten et al., 1990). Female adolescents more likely experience difficulties in adjustment, namely depression, anxiety, and lower self-esteem, according to Street and Kromrey (1994) who studied high school students.

Relative to a possible link between the internalization of anger and depressive symptomology, girls tend to score higher on dimensions labeled "worry" and "sensitive-emotional" as compared to boys who tend to score higher on dimensions related to conduct problems (Beitchman, Kruidenier, Inglis, & Clegg, 1989). Similarly, Jones and Peacock (1992) find adolescent boys more likely to express anger aggressively while adolescent girls more likely express anger by crying.

In a similar way, an inverse relationship between depression and assertiveness receives confirmation across several studies (Gotlib, 1984; Lea & Paquin, 1981; Lefevre & West, 1981). Women appear more likely to manifest this inverse relationship, which is

strongly mediated by anxiety and locus of control (Culkin & Perotto, 1985a). Culkin and Perotto (1985b) also find depression to be related to inhibited verbal expression, particularly in emotional situations. Given these relationships, and the strong evidence that anger suppression and assertiveness appear related negatively (Delamater & McNamara, 1987) it appears that both play a role in female depressive symptomology.

Female Anger

Jane Matheson (1992) quotes the familiar nursery rhyme:

"There was a little girl, who had a little curl
Right in the middle of her forehead
And when she was good, she was very, very good
And when she was bad she was horrid
She stood on her head, on her little truckle bed,
With nobody by for to hinder
She screamed and she squalled, she yelled and she bawled
And drummed her little heels against the winder
Her mother heard the noise and thought it was the boys
A-kicking up a rumpus in the attic
But when she climbed the stair, and saw Jemima there
She took her and did whip her most emphatic."

This poem, one of many in which acting out or angry women are presented in a negative light, contrasts with presentations of angry men. Harriet Lerner (1985) represents

the first wave of interest in women's anger as a topic of value for study. When she first became interested in the subject and ordered a literature search from the Menninger Clinic Library, she was amazed to learn that nothing was available. She wondered whether taboos against women's anger were reflected in its lack of attention in the literature (Thomas, 1991). Lerner (1985) wrote that anger in women is not only prohibited but given such labels as unladylike and unattractive. Thus, instead of direct anger expression, women transform such feelings into fears or hurt. Behind this transformation, Lerner theorizes, is the unconscious fear of being omnipotently destructive, as well as separation anxiety. Females particularly fear the alienation of those with whom they have intimate relationships, and so, suppress angry feelings to preserve harmony. Expression of anger towards men in particular takes on such descriptions as strident, unmaternal and sexually unattractive. When they do feel angry, women begin to ask themselves questions which block or invalidate expression of the feeling, leading to depression, guilt and self doubt. These negative internalizations may be thought of as actions taken against the self.

Collier (1982) writes that society routinely teaches women not to express anger and in some instances, not to even feel it. Thus, she believes most women learn to hide anger or release it indirectly. Lemkau and Landau (1986) view women's difficulty with anger as reflecting a selfless attention to enhancing relational ties with a corresponding cost to self-awareness.

Gilligan (1990) calls anger the "political emotion par excellence - the bellwether of oppression, injustice, bad treatment, the clue that something is wrong in the relational

surround" (p.527). Debold, Wilson, and Malave (1993) write that though for "most working class women and certain women of color, anger - often expressed as hostility and defiance - is an almost omnipresent defense that tells the world to watch out . . . almost all women have lost the righteousness of anger, the power of anger to demand change." Brown and Gilligan (1992) write that White middle-class girls receive pressure from the dominant culture to bury or disown their anger in the name of femininity.

Bernardez-Bonesatti (1978) also asserted that women fear anger because of its potential for disruption of relationships with men. She claimed that in response, women redirect their anger against the self or their own sex, less powerful persons (children) or vent in an inimical fashion. Kopper (1993) finds women more likely to express anger as indirect hostility, irritability and dependency. Women choose these options rather than risk the loss of support and approval from significant males, and concomitant loss of self-esteem. Women who express oppositional feelings or behave in anything other than the image of a "totally empathic, non-aggressive, other-serving manner" arouse the stereotype of the "bad mother" (Bernardez, 1987).

Kopper and Epperson (1991) write that cultural taboos against women's experience and expression of anger culminate in a milieu which reinforces women for hiding, suppressing, or indirectly expressing anger. Their study found sex role orientation, rather than sex per se to predict anger expression style. Those with feminine sex role orientations least likely expressed anger outwardly and most likely controlled the expression of anger.

Stearns (1992), alongside an acknowledgment that anger has historically been viewed as in need of control, reports on the influence of anger in Victorian society. At this time, anger was viewed as decidedly unfeminine for women but necessary for men to give them a useful advantage in business and politics. Although the 20th century has brought a new set of standards for men, Stearns writes that both sexes are now encouraged to "control" anger. Perhaps as a hangover from Victorian times, men are seen as prone to display their anger uncontrollably while women are characterized as not experiencing angry impulses.

Psychiatrist Jean Baker Miller (1983) developed a feminist argument in which the expression of anger becomes differentially reinforced in our culture for males and females. She identified internalized cultural concepts of femininity as responsible for the self-denial necessary in anger suppression, her ideas resting on the assumption of male dominance and female subordinance in our culture. Subordinates' suppression of anger becomes reinforced by: (a) threat of direct force, and (b) the insinuation that subordinates have no valid cause for anger. Females, therefore adopt beliefs consistent with those of the dominant cultural rules (i.e., "I have no right to be angry."). For Miller, the consequence of such suppression and denial of self is the expression of anger through symptoms (psychic or somatic).

Correspondingly, theorists predict that females should use defenses to direct feelings internally, where males use defenses to direct feelings externally (Brody, 1985). Consistent with these predictions are studies indicating that with age, both boys and girls

increasingly understand that emotional experience and expression do not have one-to-one correspondence. Girls increasingly inhibit "negative" expression of feeling (Shennum & Bugental, 1982) whereas boys neutralize overall expressiveness. Girls tend to inhibit negative affects, turning them against themselves. Boys tend to project negative feelings externally, consistent with sex role stereotypes (Brody, 1985). Females' anger is identified by others significantly less than would be expected by chance, or is perceived as sadness or happiness (Feinman & Feldman, 1982). Despite these findings, the overall paucity of research in women's anger experience (Thomas, 1993) lends credibility to the claim that social forces interact with women's emotional development to suppress or deny its existence.

To summarize literature reviewed concerning anger, it appears that conflict has permeated research and theorizing on the subject for quite some time. From the early Greek descriptions of anger, through psychoanalytic formulations, the conflict emerges between acknowledgment of anger's protective function in human behavior and fear of consequences associated with it. This historical fear of anger may owe in part to its confusion with aggression and hostility in the literature (Thomas, 1990). Again employing dictionary assistance, Microsoft Encarta (1994) defines aggression as "the initiation of unprovoked hostilities," and hostility as "antagonism or enmity." In contrast, their definition for anger reads "a strong feeling of displeasure, resentment, or hostility," the emphasis falling on anger as a feeling state versus an initiation of action per se. At any

rate, theorists as well as laypersons have struggled with understanding this emotion and the historically evident inclination to control or suppress it.

Cognitive-behavioral theorists point to one's beliefs as mediators between events and experience of anger. This approach acknowledges internal variables that intervene in the manifestation of anger but focuses less on its survival-related functions. Viewing anger from a social-interpersonal point of view helps to round out each of the previously mentioned theories. Relationships become a prominent survival issue which elicit both angry feeling and cognition, thereby giving credence to both anger's protective function and embeddedness within the relational environment.

Studying women's anger requires looking at specific gender socialization messages surrounding its experience. Parallel with expectations for females to be docile versus opinionated, prescriptions regarding anger involve its: (1) unattractiveness, (2) potential for harming relationships, and (3) incompatability with the phantasmic ideal girl or woman. Further, acknowledging anger as a vehicle by which independent selfhood is reinforced presents an apparent conundrum for understanding females' experience of the emotion. Stated differently, a challenge in understanding female emotional development consists of reconciling the notions that: (a) women receive social reinforcement for denying and suppressing anger, and (b) anger is an ego-focused emotion that helps redefine the integrity of the self and its more autonomous aspects. If girls are socialized into a more relational or interdependent orientation, this process could take place via sanctions against female anger.

Summary

Reviewing both traditional and nontraditional models of emotion generates several observations regarding its survival-related and motivational function in human experience. Combining these formulations with theories of emotional development provides a clearer picture of the emergence of complexities in emotional experience. Specifically, a broad-based view of emotional development incorporates both the gradual increase in emotion management behavior and the survival-related necessity most likely motivating this process. Viewing emotion as both a social phenomenon and a motivator for adaptive behavior, it follows that feeling intense emotion in the context of social relationships could have adaptive significance. The direct release of such emotion, namely anger, appears related not only to catharsis for its own sake but also to facilitating assertion of individual integrity.

Not only does emotion within relationships constitute an adaptive, behavior-modifying process, it becomes modified by the social context in which it emerges. Thus, a circular and recursive process evolves between emotion, behavioral manifestation (including affective response), and requirements of the social surround. These views reflect the present author's thinking about emotion, emotional development, and anger as well.

The implications embedded in this process are also gender sensitive. Following formulations of female emotional development, it becomes clear that as all individuals' experience comes under increasing influence by its social context, women's experience

carries specific diminishing or suppressing influence, via prescribed images of "ideal femininity" and cultural messages prohibiting female anger.

Anger, labeled a politically relevant, informational emotion, facilitates an individual's sense of survival-related behavior. Anger also fosters ego-focused adaptation, a sense of one's individual rights and integrity. The suppression and (or) denial of anger in individuals relates to a variety of physical and emotional problems, including depression and lower levels of assertiveness.

Adolescence brings a critical juncture in female emotional development wherein culturally-prescribed messages about proper femininity begin to interfere with girls' more self-promoting developmental tasks. Teenaged girls report more depression, negative self and body image, eating disorders, hopeless feelings and suicide attempts than teenaged boys. Their adjustment problems appear related to internalization of distress while their male cohorts appear more likely to externalize distress. Because of this internalization, it is speculated that gender socialization messages play a critical role in the evolution of girls' adjustment difficulties. Specifically, the suppression of anger is hypothesized to carry gender-prescriptive cognition-emotion sets to inform behavior and contribute to the circularity between anger, its expression, and its psychosocial environment.

Stated differently, a review and juxtaposition of traditional and nontraditional theories of emotion with theories of development suggests some form of direct anger expression to be healthy or adaptive for its clarifying or strengthening of ego-integrity. Alongside this idea, however, sits the observation by many feminist and other writers that

such direct expression is discouraged in females, particularly at adolescence. Given these theories and observations, it follows that adolescent girls would experience confusion and symptoms indicative of internalized anger, namely negative self image, anxiety, eating disorders, reduced feelings of competence and depression.

The following research questions emerge from such a supposition. Given the developmental impact of gender socialization messages prohibitive of female anger expression, do girls suppress more anger than boys, with older girls suppressing more anger than younger girls? Additionally, due to the psychologically-compromising effects of anger suppression, and its established relationship with depression, do girls report higher rates of depression than boys, with older girls showing more depression than younger girls? Does anger suppression relate positively with depression in both boys and girls of all age groups, as demonstrated in adults?

From these research questions, the following specific hypotheses are generated.

(1) Girls across grade groups sampled will score higher on Anger-control, Anger-in (or anger-suppression), and Anger-distraction, as measured by the Pediatric Anger Expression Scale III (PAES III; Jacobs, Phelps, & Rohrs, 1989) than will boys.

(2) Girls across grade groups sampled will score higher on depression, as measured by the Children's Depression Inventory (Kovacs, 1986; CDI, 1992) than will boys.

(3) Boys across grade groups will score higher on Anger-out, as measured by the PAES III, than will girls.

(4) Older girls will score higher on Anger-control, Anger-suppression, Anger-distraction, and depression compared to younger girls.

(5) For all participants, regardless of grade grouping or gender, there will be a positive correlation between Anger-suppression and depression.

(6) There will be a significant difference in the magnitude of the correlations between Anger-suppression and depression between younger and older girls, with older girls showing higher correlations.

(7) There will be no significant difference between the magnitude of the correlations between Anger-suppression and depression between younger and older boys.

(8) With increasing age, the disparity between boys and girls in the magnitudes of their correlations between Anger-suppression and depression will increase, with girls showing increasingly larger correlations.

Exploratory qualitative interviews and content analysis are expected to generate depth, detail, and contextual examples to enhance information obtained in the quantitative investigation portion of the study. This further depth of information will involve girls' perceptions of how they are viewed by significant others when they are angry. It is expected that such open-ended questioning will reveal feelings on the part of fifth and eighth grade girls which are consistent with their scores on the CDI and PAES III. Further, girls will generate information about how socialization processes influence their experience and expression of anger, along with resulting attitudes about the self.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Participants

The sample for the quantitative portion of this study consisted of 161 volunteer elementary, middle, and high school students enrolled in a large, urban public school district. Two grade groupings, fourth through sixth and seventh through ninth, were selected for study. Students were selected from a number of available, randomly selected classrooms at two participating Montessori academies and one comprehensive high school. These were metropolitan magnet schools, which admitted students in conformity with the overall ethnic balance of the school district.

Of the 161 students selected for participation, 75 were in grades four through six while 86 were in grades seven through nine. Of the total sample, 101 were female (62.7%) and 60 were male (37.2%). Of the females, 46 belonged to the younger grade group (45.5%) while 55 belonged to the older grade group (54.4%). Of the males, 29 belonged to the younger grade group (48.3%) while 31 belonged to the older grade group (51.6%). Ethnic makeup of the overall sample consisted of the following: 41.6% were African American (N=67); 27.9%, Hispanic (N=45); 26.7%, White (N=43); 3.7%, Asian (N=5) and .6%, other (N=1).

For the qualitative portion of the study, five fifth grade girls and three eighth grade girls were recruited for participation from randomly selected classrooms at the two participating Montessori academies. Of the fifth grade interview sample, two were African American, one was White and two were Hispanic. Of the eighth grade interview sample, two were White and one was African American.

Instruments

Anger Suppression

The Pediatric Anger Expression Scale (PAES; Jacobs and Blumer, 1985, see Appendix A), which was an extension of the Anger Expression Scale (AX; Spielberger, Johnson & Jacobs, 1982), was a trait measure originally consisting of 10 items reflecting the orthogonal factors of Anger-out and Anger-in. Participants are instructed to rate the frequency with which they use the specified manner of expression when angry on a three-point scale ranging from (1) "hardly ever" to (3) "often." Anger-in was defined as the turning of anger inward toward self or the suppression of anger, with Anger-out defined as the outward expression or demonstration of anger. Each factor consisted of five items, with items-loadings ranging from .64 to .75 and a standardized alpha reliability coefficient of .74 for Anger-out, and item loadings ranging from .39 to .77, with a standardized alpha reliability coefficient of .67 for Anger-in.

In a later investigation, Jacobs, Phelps and Rohrs (1989) added five more items to the scale in order to assess an Anger-reflection style, with the added items being adapted from the Coping Skills Inventory (Tobin, Holroyd & Reynolds, 1984). As the result of

further psychometric evaluation of the PAES in Tobin et al's. study, a four-factor structure was derived; Anger-out, Anger-control, Anger-reflection, and Anger-suppression. As with previous studies, item-total correlations and standardized alpha reliability coefficients were computed. Anger-out showed item-total correlations ranging from .44 to .58, with an alpha coefficient of .75; Anger-control item-total correlations ranged from .47 to .52, with an alpha coefficient of .68; Anger-reflection showed item-total correlations ranging from .29 to .50, with an associated coefficient alpha of .63; and Anger-suppression showed item-total correlations of .50, with an alpha coefficient of .67. Concurrent validity of the PAES was also evaluated by correlating factor scores from the PAES with self-ratings, peer-ratings, and teacher ratings. The PAES was correlated with scores from: the Pediatric Anxiety Scale and the Pediatric Anger Scale (Jacobs, 1989); the Hunter-Wolf A-B Rating Scale for rating type A behaviors (Hunter, Wolf, Sklov, Webber, Watson, & Berenson, 1982); the Classmate Behavior Checklist (adapted from Wiggins & Winder, 1961); the Matthews Youth Test for Health, a measure of type A behavior (Matthews & Angulo, 1980); and the Teacher's Student Rating Form (Jacobs et al., 1989).

Anger-out correlated positively with self-measures of state and trait anxiety and anger and also with a measure of type A behavior. Correlations with trait anger were particularly high (0.71 for females, 0.74 for males). For males, Anger-out positively correlated with peer ratings of anger and teacher ratings of anxiety and impatience. Anger-out for males negatively correlated with teacher ratings of anger-in and self-control.

Anger-control correlated negatively with self-measures of state and trait anxiety and anger as well as with a measure of type A behavior. For both sexes, Anger-control negatively correlated with teacher ratings of type A behavior. For females, Anger-control scores positively correlated with peer ratings of shyness, and negatively with teacher ratings of impatience.

Anger-reflection scores negatively correlated with self-ratings of state anxiety, type A behavior and teacher ratings of impatience. For females, peer ratings of shyness correlated positively and teacher ratings of impatience correlated negatively with Anger-reflection. Teacher anger ratings for females and teacher type A behavior ratings for males correlated negatively with Anger-reflection scores.

Anger-suppression correlated negatively with self-reported trait anger. Further, for females, peer ratings of shyness positively correlated with anger-suppression while teacher ratings of impatience and type A behavior negatively correlated with anger-suppression.

For reasons not clearly stated, in a later study, the PAES III, an earlier three-factor version of the PAES, was used to investigate the relationships between anger expression styles and risk factors for maladjustment among children with chronic illness (Hagglund, Clay, Frank, Beck, Kashani, Hewett, Johnson, Goldstein & Cassidy, 1994). As a part of the overall study, the PAES III was subjected to further psychometric evaluation. This three-factor structure of the PAES consisted of Anger-in, Anger-out, and Anger-control. Results of these authors' evaluation of the concurrent validity of the PAES showed good correspondence in expected directions with the Anger and Hostility scales from the

Differential Emotions Scale-IV (Izard, Dougherty, Blowxom & Kotsch, 1974) and with the Aggressive subscale of the Child Behavior Check List (CBCL; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983).

Further, Hagglund et al. (1994) factor analyzed the 15-item PAES III. Results of this analysis, using Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation, yielded a four-factor structure. The obtained factors were: Anger-out (five items), Anger-in (four items), Anger-control (four items), and Anger-distraction (two items). The Anger-out factor closely corresponds, in both item content and definition, to the original Anger-out factor from the PAES. The Anger-in factor closely resembles the earlier defined Anger-suppression factor. The Anger-control factor was defined as the cognitive portion of mediation of angry feelings, while the Anger-distraction represented behavioral means for mediating anger (attempting to divert one's attention away from the anger experience).

In sum, the overall pattern of results from the aforementioned studies suggests that the PAES III demonstrates adequate concurrent, content, and construct validity. The PAES III also appears to show reasonable internal consistency/reliability.

Depression

The variable of depression was measured using the children's self-report version of the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI, 1992; Kovacs, 1986, see Appendix B). Several studies point to the CDI's frequency of use and more thoroughly explored psychometric properties (Kazdin, 1981; Strauss, Forehand, Frame, & Smith, 1984; Crowley, Thompson, & Worchel, 1994). The instrument was devised for seven- to seventeen-year old children

and is based on the Beck Depression Inventory for adults (Beck, 1967). The CDI consists of 27 items which are symptom-oriented and scored 0, 1, or 2, with a higher score indicating a more depressed response. The range of possible scores on the CDI is zero through 54. A total score greater than 11 suggests at least mild depression (Kaslow, Rehm, & Siegel, 1984), while a score greater than 19 suggests severe depression (Smucker, Craighead, Craighead, & Green, 1986).

Strauss, et al. (1984) find the CDI to discriminate between children with and without symptoms commonly believed to be associated with depression in children and adults. These characteristics include low self-esteem, anxiety, attention and concentration problems, and social difficulties.

Discriminant validity of the CDI has also been tested (Romano & Nelson, 1988). Groups of children diagnosed with depression, other psychopathology, and without diagnoses differed significantly from each other, as reflected by Wilks's lambda = .22, which is equivalent to $F(6, 32) = 6.10$, $p < .0002$. Specific to the child self-report form of the CDI, Romano and Nelson further report a significant difference between the three groups, $F(2, 18) = 22.10$, $p < .0001$. This finding supports the concept that children can report their own depressive symptomatology. In addition, post hoc analysis reveals that depressed children consider themselves to be significantly more depressed than children with other types of symptomatology. The mean of CDI-C scores for this depressive group fell well within the depressive range (13 or above) whereas the means for psychiatric (other diagnosis) and normal children fell well below this range.

Reliability studies report alpha coefficients for the CDI in the .70s and .80s. Specifically, Smucker et al. (1986) calculate alphas of .84 and .87 for male and female third through sixth grade students, respectively; .83 and .85 for male and female seventh through ninth graders, respectively; and .89 for both sexes for another sample of sixth through eighth graders. Weiss (1990, cited in Crowley et al., 1994) finds alphas of .96 for children and .88 for adolescents from samples seeking treatment at mental health facilities and Kovacs (1981, cited in Crowley et al., 1994) reports a coefficient alpha of .86 for a sample of children and adolescents in various diagnostic categories.

With regard to stability, Kovacs (1986) reports a test-retest reliability coefficient of .82 over a four-week period with a sample of diabetic children and .84 during a nine-week period for a sample of public school children. Test-retest correlation of .83 is reported by Kaslow, Rehm, and Siegel (1984) for elementary school children during a 3-week period. Thus, it appears the CDI is stable over time.

Qualitative Interview

Girls selected for the qualitative portion of the study were interviewed in four groupings, two interviews for both fifth and eighth graders. Audiotape recording was used for collection and later interpretation of data. The interview was based on an open-ended format (Patton, 1990), employing the following questions:

(1) What do boys think about girls who are angry? About other boys who are angry?

(2) What do girls think about other girls who are angry? About boys who are angry?

(3) What do moms think about daughters who are angry? About sons who are angry?

(4) What do dads think about daughters who are angry? About sons who are angry?

(5) What do teachers think about girls who are angry? About boys who are angry?

The purpose of this portion of the study was to gather more in-depth information about girls' perceptions of how they are viewed or treated when angry, as opposed to how their male counterparts are viewed or treated. Although data were generated regarding anger expression style and depression, it was speculated that more richness of detail would be made available by listening to girls talk about their experiences, feelings, and opinions. Precedent for this kind of study was set by Gilligan et al. (1990), and Brown (1995) as well as others (Stern, 1991) who have used open-ended interview approaches for gathering information directly from girls about their experience. Brown (1991) suggested that actually listening to girls speak about themselves and their relationships is the only way to fully understand how they story their lives.

Procedure

Quantitative

Appropriate numbers of children were identified in available participating classrooms, balancing ethnic percentages across classrooms. Letters and consent forms

were sent home with selected children (see Appendix C), detailing the intent and purpose of the study and soliciting parental permission. Participant rights were explained in the letter, including anonymity of data, right of withdrawal and access to the investigator for questions or concerns.

Participating children were administered the objective measures during specially arranged periods in their school day. Care was taken to work with classroom teachers to gather data at convenient times for children and school personnel. Since only certain classrooms were available for participation, arrangements were made to work with groups of classmates at a time, so as to minimize overall disruption of routine. In this portion of the study, each child's anonymity was protected via a coding procedure in which children's response sheets were only identified by number.

Qualitative

To begin the recruitment phase of this study's qualitative investigation, six girls each from grades five and eight were selected at random to participate in open-ended interviews. These girls were identified within participating classrooms and selected in keeping with balanced ethnic percentages. Consent forms and letters explaining the nature of the investigation were sent home with each of the girls (see Appendix C), and eight of the twelve were returned. These eight girls formed groups for interviews, five fifth graders (two and three in separate interviews) and three eighth graders (two and one in separate interviews).

Girls were interviewed in grade groupings, using audiotape recording for collection and interpretation of responses. In reporting data, distinctions among each particular child's responses were made, while protecting individual anonymity. Separate cover letters and consent forms were sent to selected students' parents, detailing the purpose of the study, participant rights, and related safeguards. Children participating in this portion of the study chose pseudonyms by which to be represented in the interpretation and reporting of the data.

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics were computed on all study variables to better illustrate characteristics of the overall sample. Prior to examining the main study hypotheses, a factor analysis, using Principle Components Analysis with Varimax rotation, of the PAES III was undertaken to confirm the factor structure of the instrument found by Hagglund et al. (1994). This four-factor structure was then used to guide the construction of factor scores for use in subsequent analyses.

Hypotheses one through four were tested utilizing a 2 x 2 MANOVA, using gender (at two levels) and grade group (at two levels) as grouping factors, with PAES III factor scores and the CDI Total score (as a measure of depression) as the dependent variable set. This analysis provided for evaluation of whether boys and girls differ, whether age groups differ, and whether unique combinations of age and gender yield significant differences on the dependent variable set. Where significant differences were found, follow-up t-tests were performed to more fully explore the origins of such differences.

Hypothesis five was evaluated utilizing a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. For hypotheses six through eight, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between anger-suppression and depression within each age and gender group were computed. These analyses were followed by computing a series of Fisher's Exact Z values to test for significant differences in magnitudes of correlations. The transformations first tested for such differences between genders within age groups, then within gender between age groups. Thus, a series of nine Fisher's Z tests were performed.

Qualitative Interview

Following the objective data gathering portion of this study, eight girls were selected for qualitative interview. Using Patton's (1990) maximum variation sampling technique, girls were sampled to achieve optimal ethnic and SES diversity in the qualitative interview component of the study. This diversified sampling was achieved by randomly selecting classrooms for recruitment at the two Montessori academies. Both academies admit students based on the overall ethnic percentages in the school district, one located in the southern part and the other in the northern part of the city. The academy located in the southern region tends to also attract applicants from the widest variety of SES backgrounds. Seven of the eight girls interviewed were recruited from this particular school, their parents holding primarily blue-collar positions at work. A round of recruitment was undertaken at the northerly-located academy with the intent of balancing the sample with regard to SES.

The logic behind interviewing only girls lies in studying information-rich cases for depth of understanding (Patton, 1990). Rationale for maximizing SES diversity was based on Brown's (1995) findings that social class influenced girls' learning of anger expression style and stereotypically feminine behavior.

Tape recordings of the complete open-ended interviews were transcribed. Following several readings of the raw data, answers given to interview questions were organized with notation of trends.Content analysis was then performed by coding those responses which conformed to the eight listed categories of data. Responses of interviewees were coded as to their conformity with a data-generated classification system.

The classification system was developed by recording responses of interviewees, using their actual words, combining those that appeared to convey duplicate meanings, and assigning two-letter abbreviations for each. Some synonymous words or phrases were selected to replace actual words of interviewees when slang or other vernacular word usage was noted. All categories of responses ("behaviors of individuals perceiving angry girls," etc.) were given a set of these response abbreviations after collecting every pertinent response for each category.

For example, with regard to "feelings of individuals perceiving angry girls," eleven different responses of that type were collected, thus eleven two-letter abbreviation codes were created. Broad categories were then divided into sub-categories related to the identity of the perceiver and gender of the angry person perceived. For instance, "feelings

of individuals perceiving angry girls" was further divided into "feelings of moms perceiving angry girls," "feelings of dads perceiving angry girls," "feelings of boys perceiving angry girls," and so on, with analogous sub-categories for all perceivers of angry boys (see Appendix D, Figures 1-3).

After all four interview transcripts had been initially coded by the investigator with regard to each of the eight evolved categories of responses, the process was subjected to "analytic triangulation" (Patton, 1990). Using this approach, validity of the qualitative analysis was safeguarded by having the system of coding performed by a research assistant, using a separate copy of the identical raw interview data. The research assistant was familiar with qualitative data analysis but blind to the major hypotheses of the study. At the completion of both the investigator's and assistant's independent coding, the two were compared and discussed, allowing for both "analyst triangulation" and "theory/perspective triangulation." In this way, both the findings themselves and interpretations thereof were reviewed from dual perspectives.

First, a quantitative comparison was made in which each coded response was compared, with like and unlike codings tallied separately. Using approximately 40% of the transcript data, a 68% agreement was reached between the investigator and assistant in coding assignments. Upon discussion, however, inter-coder agreement was determined to be underestimated by the previous calculation, due to many instances of overlap in codes used. Following comparison and discussion of codes, several apparent redundancies

were eliminated by combination. Discussion of each transcript revealed more general trends to be included in a narrative review both within and across interviews.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Quantitative

Descriptive statistics were computed on a limited range of demographic variables. These included grade group of student (younger or older), sex of student, and ethnicity. Of the entire sample of 161 participants, 75 were in grades four through six and 86 were in grades seven through nine. Sixty-two point seven percent (N=101) of the participants were female, with the remaining 37.3% (N=60) being male. The majority of the study participants fell into three primary ethnic groups. The largest portion of the sample was African American (41.6%, N=67), with Hispanic and White groups being the next largest (28%, N=45, and 26.7%, N=43, respectively).

To confirm the factor structure of the PAES III, a factor analysis using Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted. Results of this analysis yielded four factors with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 57.6% of the variability. For an item to be selected for inclusion on a given factor, a factor loading of ± .50 was selected. This criterion was similar to, but more conservative than, that used by Hagglund et al. (1994). Factor structure and item-factor loadings are presented in Table 1.

The derived factor structure for the PAES III was nearly identical to the factor structure found by Hagglund et al. (1994). There was an 86.7% agreement of items

Table 1

PAES III Varimax Rotated Factor Structure

Item Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	-.2546	.2250	.6984	.1011
2	.6377	-.3153	-.0436	.0646
3	-.2698	.5142	.4545	-.2161
4	.0368	.0818	.0902	.8586
5	.6429	-.0957	-.0189	-.2479
6	-.2691	.7370	.2690	-.0599
7	-.5697	.1136	.4645	.1105
8	.6386	-.1568	-.0836	-.0329
9	-.3804	.6401	.0947	-.0321
10	-.2536	-.0825	-.0553	.5451
11	.6139	-.0017	-.4393	-.2110
12	.0281	.0963	.7859	-.0582
13	-.2863	.0566	.5367	.4925
14	.5997	-.2248	-.1805	-.0967
15	-.0327	.8443	.0259	.1554

NOTE: Underlining indicates a significant item-factor loading

significantly loading onto each of the four factors. In fact, the only variation was one item which loaded significantly on factor one versus factor three as found by Hagglund et al. (1994). Given the high degree of correspondence found, the obtained factor structure was used to guide the derivation of PAES III scores for later analysis. Thus, four factors were computed; Anger-out, Anger-in (or Anger-suppression), Anger-control, and Anger-distraction. Table two lists means and standard deviations for the entire sample on both the PAES III subscales and the CDI total score. Information is given for boys and for girls at both grade groupings.

Hypotheses one through four were evaluated using a 2 X 2 MANOVA, using sex of student (at two levels) and grade of student (at two levels) as grouping factors with scores for Anger-out, Anger-control, Anger-suppression, Anger-distraction and depression as the dependent variable set.

Table 2

Mean Scores on PAES III and CDI Subscales

	PAES III Ang.-Out		PAES III Ang.-Sup.		PAES III Ang.-Con.		PAES III Ang.-Dis.		CDI Tot.	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
Boys (total)	1.92	2.84	6.73	1.89	6.22	1.56	3.62	1.24	9.45	6.57
Younger	12.45	2.84	5.45	1.50	6.03	1.55	3.55	1.20	9.69	7.04
Older	11.42	2.80	7.00	2.18	6.39	1.60	3.68	1.30	9.23	6.21
Girls (total)	10.48	2.73	8.02	2.24	6.74	1.51	3.86	1.16	9.64	7.62
Younger	10.07	2.45	8.24	1.99	6.91	1.46	4.12	1.20	7.87	7.01
Older	10.82	2.93	7.84	2.44	6.60	1.56	3.65	1.09	11.13	7.85
Total Sample	11.01	2.85	7.54	2.20	6.55	1.55	3.77	1.19	9.57	7.23

NOTE: Ranges for PAES III subscale scores are as follows: anger-out, 6-18; anger-suppression, 4-12; anger-control, 3-9; and anger-distraction, 2-6. The range for CDI total scores was 0-36).

Hypothesis one, that girls across age groups will score higher on Anger-control, Anger- suppression, and Anger-distraction than will boys, was partially supported. The MANOVA revealed a significant main effect for gender (Wilks Lambda = .89, F Approx. = 3.76, df = 5, 153, p = .003). There was no significant main effect for age and no

significant interactions between age and gender on any of the PAES III scores (Wilks Lambda = .98, F Approx. = .59, df = 5, 153, p = .707; Wilks Lambda = .96, F Approx. = 1.24, df = 5, 153, p = .294).

Follow-up t-tests revealed that Anger-suppression and Anger-control contributed to the statistically significant multivariate main effect for gender (t = 3.73, df = 159, p = .0009 for Anger-suppression and t = 2.11, df = 159, p = .037 for Anger-control). It appears that, particularly in light of no significant multivariate interaction term, regardless of grade grouping examined, boys and girls differed on these measures of anger, with girls scoring significantly higher on Anger-suppression and Anger-control when compared to their male counterparts.

Hypothesis two, that girls across grade groups will score higher than boys on depression, was not supported. While, as indicated in the above, there was a significant multivariate main effect for gender, univariate follow-up analyses indicate that differences in depression scores did not significantly contribute to this multivariate difference (F = .00, df = 1,157, p = .972). Thus, boys and girls scored similarly in their depression scores.

Hypothesis three, that boys across grade groups will score higher on Anger-out than will girls, was supported. Univariate follow-up analyses to the aforementioned significant multivariate main effect for gender revealed that differences on anger-out contributed to this effect (t = -3.19, df = 159, p = .002). Boys did score significantly higher on Anger-out compared to girls.

Hypothesis four, that older girls will score higher on Anger-control, Anger-suppression, Anger-distraction and depression when compared to younger girls, was not supported. To support this hypothesis, a significant multivariate interaction term would have been required, with follow-up analyses to specifically evaluate univariate interactional differences. However, no such multivariate interaction differences were observed (Wilks Lambda = .96, F Approx. = 1.24, df = 5,153, p = .294). It appears that girls of all six grades scored similarly on the PAES III scales.

Hypothesis five, that there will be a positive correlation between Anger-suppression and depression, regardless of age or gender, was evaluated using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. Results revealed a non-significant correlation coefficient (r = -.02, p = .420). Without respect to gender or age, it appears that Anger-suppression and depression are not significantly related.

Hypothesis six, that there will be significant differences in the magnitudes of correlations between Anger-suppression and depression between younger and older girls, with older girls showing larger correlations, was evaluated via a two-step process. First, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between Anger-suppression and depression for older and younger girls separately (r = .09, p = .25; and r = -.10, p = .26, respectively). Then, the obtained correlations were converted to Fisher's Z scores for use in a two-sample z test to determine if the magnitude of difference between the obtained correlations was significantly different. Results indicated no statistically significant difference in the magnitudes of correlations (z = .92, p > .05). In fact, the

correlations between Anger-suppression and depression were not in themselves statistically significant for either age group of girls.

Hypothesis seven, a replication of hypothesis six using boys instead of girls, was evaluated using the same process as for Hypothesis six. As with the prior hypothesis, no statistically significant difference in the magnitude of correlations was observed ($z = .919$, $p > .05$). Thus, as with girls of different ages, boys of different ages did not differ with respect to their degree of relationship between Anger-suppression and depression, nor were the magnitudes of the correlations themselves statistically significant (r for younger boys = -.250; r for older boys = .062).

Finally, hypothesis eight, that the disparity between boys and girls in the magnitudes of their correlations between Anger-suppression and depression will increase with age, with girls showing increasingly larger correlations, was not supported. This hypothesis suggested that younger boys and girls would significantly differ with respect to the magnitudes of correlations between Anger-suppression and depression, and that this difference would become larger when evaluated for older boys and girls. This hypothesis was not supported on either count; no significant differences in the magnitude of correlations were observed between either younger boys and girls ($z = .638$, $p > .05$) or older boys and girls ($z = .133$, $p > .05$). Thus, regardless of age group or gender, no differences in magnitudes of correlations between Anger-suppression and depression were found. Additionally, none of the correlations between Anger-suppression and depression for younger females, younger males, older females, or older males were found to be

statistically significant (r for younger females = -.097, r for younger males = -.250, r for older females = .093, r for older males = .062).

Qualitative

The qualitative interview portion of this study involved girls who were recruited, but who also chose voluntarily to participate. Therefore, interviewees tended to be enthusiastic about the topic of anger. Likewise, the investigator brought to the interview setting a large degree of enthusiasm about the topic of anger. This fervor necessarily affected the presentation of questions to participants and likely the responses given by interviewees as well. The following discussion on the investigator's experience introduces a qualitative examination of each interview as well as providing some background for understanding the interpretation of those interviews.

To begin, several behaviors were noted on the part of girls interviewed which affected the interviewer's interpretation of the content of each transcript and also influenced the way in which questions were presented. First, younger girls appeared to misunderstand certain abstractions presented. For example, when queried regarding boys' feelings about angry girls, some of the fifth grade girls looked confused and hesitated before answering, then offered responses which seemed to reflect misunderstanding such a scenario. Following this observation, the interviewer used reminiscence to evoke memories of actual events. In some cases, the interviewer asked girls to think about the last time they were really angry about something, and then put forth the question 'how do boys feel about you when you're angry?' to clarify what was being asked.

Second, many of the girls interviewed used hand-gestures and facial expressions when answering questions about anger. These expressions, not directly captured in either the transcripts or the following analyses, did facilitate the investigator's interpretation of many statements made. For example, when speaking of explosive expressions of anger, several of the girls widened their eyes and used violent hand gestures to depict a volatile situation. These were often coupled with some use of slang or colloquialisms to describe the episode, later analyzed as being explosive. Similarly, the auditory effects of girls' accent on particular words influenced the decoding of several rather nebulous usages of peer-accepted vernacular in the description of angry episodes or of others' reactions.

Finally, an observation of girls during interviews provided justification for the assumption that many of them experienced difficulty conceptualizing their own emotional experience and how it is perceived by others. Several fifth grade girls hesitated for long periods before answering questions about how they are perceived by parents when they are angry. The combination of their hesitation to answer and their facial expressions suggested they were struggling to put those ideas together and formulate their own assessments. Such observations led to a reshaping of the question to emphasize girls' anger and use of reminiscence as mentioned above. To reshape questions, the interviewer often repeated parts of the original question to place importance on the girl's feelings as central to the idea, like 'how did he feel about you last time you were really, really angry?' This reshaping often seemed to clarify the intent of the question for interviewees, but also

may have influenced the way in which girls responded by heightening their own awarenesses of their recalled anger.

Regarding the investigator's own process, certain observations and assumptions guided the informal structure of interviews and also reflected an ongoing response to the interviewees. First, in questioning girls about their anger experiences, the investigator was very concerned about being clear and understandable. As mentioned previously, this may have resulted in overemphasis on certain components in the interview questions themselves. When girls appeared confused about meanings, the interviewer often repeated ideas to emphasize both the girls' emotional experience in question and then their awareness of how others felt about that experience. As discussed before, this process led to substantial reshaping of questions as well as the use of reminiscence to help girls remember angry scenarios.

Second, the interviewer was often concerned with keeping a rather strict time schedule, in cooperation with girls' classroom teachers. This structure resulted in brief treatment of some responses which appeared to warrant further discussion. Many issues raised by the girls seemed deserving of follow-up interviews, but because of time limitations, were impossible to explore further.

During the first eighth grade interview, the investigator experienced anxiety in response to the girls' reticence and used significant prompting and cajoling to elicit conversation. As with reshaping and restating of questions, this interviewer behavior may have biased responses given. Specifically, girls may have eventually performed for the

apparently eager investigator by offering opinions that reflected the tailoring of questions. Similarly, as the investigator was very often amused and laughing during the second fifth grade interview, girls' more humorous responses may have been differentially reinforced.

Themes Within-Interviews

Interview One, Fifth Grade Girls: Cassandra, Deborah, Clementine

History

The three girls participating in my first fifth grade interview came from the same classroom (fourth through sixth grade classroom), in a public Montessori academy located in the southern region of the city. Having known each other for several years, they reported being friends and having lots of daily contact. When asked about their unique strengths or talents, they jumped in to remind each other what they noticed their friends doing well. Further, many of their comments revealed familiarity with each other's families. All three girls appeared casually dressed in jeans and tennis shoes.

Cassandra, an eleven year old Hispanic female, was the oldest of three siblings in an intact two-parent family. While her mother worked at home, her father held a blue-collar position with the city's maintenance department. She was of average build, quiet and reserved, listening carefully to each of her peers before offering comments of her own.

Deborah, an eleven year old African American female was a middle child of six in a blended two-parent family. She was the oldest of the three siblings living in her home. Deborah was the smallest of the three girls being interviewed, but by far the most

talkative. Her quick, sarcastic wit made her very entertaining as she formed immediate opinions about nearly everyone and everything mentioned.

Clementine, a twelve-year-old African American female was the middle child of eight children but lived with only her grandmother and great-grandmother at the time of the interview. She was tall and slender but slouched considerably as if to obscure her height. Clementine was often seen in the hallway crying, usually having injured herself in P.E. or feeling offended at some peer's behavior toward her. Her face was typically drawn into an angry scowl.

Interview Themes

Regarding anger in general, the first noteworthy interview theme is that this group seemed to understand the abstract concept of anger, without necessarily having to attach a behavioral example of the construct in their answers to interview questions. For example, in response to a question regarding boys' perceptions of angry girls, Deborah gave an abstract answer dealing with emotion and opinion, versus simple, observable behavior.

DC: "what do boys think of girls when girls are angry?"

DE: "they think you're kind of crazy when you get mad at them and stuff, and then, 'I'm just playing' and then you be taking it serious and stuff."

The previous passage illustrates a gender-related theme with regard to boys' perceptions of their anger to be explored later in this section. Regarding anger in general, these fifth grade girls at times seemed to confuse subject and object in their responses to questions about the emotion. When asked about their own or "girls'" anger, they often

gave answers more aptly reflecting someone else's anger with them. When the group was asked to describe how mothers and fathers feel about angry girls, one member gave the following reply.

DC: "What about dads? How do dads feel about girls who are angry?"

CL: "My daddy pity me (laughs)."

DE: "If I get in trouble at school, he says 'that's okay, she ain't gonna do it no more right?' I say 'yeah.' And like if I'm fixin to get a whippin, he'll say 'don't whip that girl, she ain't done nothin that bad.' I'll be like 'thank you daddy' (laughs)."

DC: "So he takes up for you?"

DE, CL: "uh-huh"

DE: "And then my mom starts getting mad - that she can't whip me (laughs)."

Although the response appears to answer the question about how dads regard angry girls, the excerpt illustrates a confusion between experiencing personal anger and being the recipient or target of someone else's anger. Most often, connecting "anger," even one's own, with "moms" or "dads" yielded an account of being in trouble with mom or dad. Cassandra appeared to have difficulty explaining or even conceptualizing how she's regarded by her father when she's angry. Following her recount of an incident in which she was in trouble at school, Cassandra responds to a query about her anger, and her father's perception of her anger.

DC: "Did you get mad about the whole thing?"

CA: "uh-huh"

DC: "And do you remember how he felt about you when you were angry?"

CA: "yyeeaah, b-"

DC: "What was that like?"

CA: "Well, I can't really explain it much."

Regarding the concept of gender, the fifth grade girls participating in this first interview portrayed contrasting pictures of boys and girls who are angry. Their immediate thoughts of angry boys had violence attached to them. When thinking of angry girls, their first impressions involved a withdrawal of some kind.

DC: "What do boys think of other boys when they're angry?"

DE: "The same thing."

CL: "They think of their fists."

DC: "They think of their fists?"

DE: "They be like 'what's up man' and they be running into each other and . . ."

CL: "When she gets angry (pointing to CA) she gets all, but when Deborah gets angry, she gets all mopey and she won't talk to nobody and stuff like that."

These girls expressed their desire to talk to each other when one of their group was angry. Clementine said "I get mad . . .I hate it when she (Deborah) ignores me."

Cassandra offered: "Well, I try to talk to her but the same with Clementine. She ignores everybody . . ." Her statement was also consistent with the girls' overall expressed means of handling anger, that is, neutralization or suppression accompanied by withdrawal. In contrast, the girls mentioned several instances of what appears to be gender-atypical behavior on the part of other girls in their social network. These instances were described with ridicule of the girls' behavior, whether or not they involved the emotion of anger. For example, in response to the question "what do girls think of other girls who are angry?" Clementine told about another girl who acts out her anger aggressively while Deborah helps to clarify the general opinion the group shares of this girl.

> CL: "Sometimes they fight (laughs). _____upstairs, her name's _____ and she loves to fight (others chime in with "oh yeah"). Always fighting, she fights everybody."
>
> DC: "What do you think of her when she's angry?"
>
> CL: "I think she's all bad (laughter from all three girls)"
>
> DC: "Now does that mean bad like you're scared of her or does that mean like she's kind of . . . "
>
> DE: "She thinks she's all that."
>
> CL: "She thinks she can fight everybody."

In the following example, all three girls described another girl's thwarted efforts to solicit a certain boy's affection. They make sense of the matter by pointing to her gender-atypical behavior, casting their own dispersions on such. At the end of this description of

generally "boyish" behavior on the part of the girl, Cassandra contributes a statement about the girl's aggression towards boys. So, not only were this person's less-than-girlish behaviors regarded negatively, her angry acting out towards male peers became associated in some way with her overall gender-atypicality. Her confidence (or her acts of confidence) seemed to be denigrated along with her aggressiveness.

CL: "That's the boy she likes (speaking of another girl outside the group). But he don't like her because he says she act too much like a boy."

DC: "Oh really?"

CL: "Like a tomboy."

DE: "She is."

CL: "She always thinks, like once she asked _____ to go with her. And she just laughed and she kept on asking and he kept on saying no."

CL: "She's always acting like a boy."

DC: "What is this acting like a boy stuff?"

DE: "Yeah, what is this . . .?"

CL: "She does boy stuff."

CA: "She wears boy clothes."

CL: "She's always out playing with the boys. She never likes to play with the girls."

CA: "She picks fights with the boys."

With regard to the same peer, this group depicted a lack of parental pressure for her to excel academically. Clementine, Deborah and Cassandra contrasted this set of circumstances with their own experience of parental pressure to perform well in school. Higher expectations for girls also extended to appearance as shown in the following excerpt. Although the girls saw both sexes as unattractive when angry, their interdiction for girls' anger-related unattractiveness came more heavily. It seemed that these girls' higher expectations for female attractiveness rendered them likely to judge a female's angry appearance more harshly than a male's.

DC: ". . .what do you look like when you're angry?"

CA, CL, DE: "mad . . . ugly."

Interview Two, Eighth Grade Girls: Whitney and Bud

History

Whitney and Bud were friends in the eighth grade at their public Montessori academy, located in the southern region of the city. Bud had been referred on several occasions to school mental health personnel for behavior and family problems. She was a Caucasian, middle-born child of a middle-class family and lived with her younger brother and both parents. Her mother taught in another Montessori school and her father was a minister. She reported that her older two siblings (a sister and a brother in their twenties) had problems with their parents as well when they lived at home. She experienced chronic anger and suicidality, presented as sullen and noncommunicative, and reported complete withdrawal from her family when at home. Bud pretended to be a boy for this interview

when asked to think of an alternate name for herself. This change of sexual identity paralleled her previous self-reports of having only male friends, and trusting only male counselors. She usually dressed in baggy jeans, an oversized T-shirt, one or more leather bracelets and dingy athletic shoes. Her straight, bleached, reddish-blonde hair was long but shaved to the scalp underneath from the tops of her ears to the back of her head. As she talked, she looked into her lap and nervously tinkered with objects on her keychain or plucked out individual hairs from her head to examine and toss onto the floor.

Whitney was an African American child of a blended family in which two of her seven siblings lived with other relatives in the area. She had several stories of physical abuse of her mother by her step-father, often in which she and (or) her siblings intervened. Although she associated herself with Bud and a few others who were often in trouble at school, Whitney herself managed to avoid acting out most of the time while she was there. When queried about her strengths, Whitney had trouble thinking of areas in which she was talented. She presented as very polite, soft-spoken and almost deferential in her conversational style. In fact, she appeared very sensitive to the feelings of Bud in our interview, often looking at her while speaking to determine Bud's reactions. She was tall and slender, dressing in a feminine, casual outfit, jeans and a knit top with gold jewelry.

Interview Themes

Again with regard to anger in general, these two eighth grade girls appeared to understand the abstract concept without necessarily tying it to observable behavior. For

example, Bud responded to a question regarding her dad's feelings about her when she is angry.

> B: "I mean I think that he'd be upset that I was angry, not like upset with me because I was angry but like I'd like to think he'd want to help but like, no."

This excerpt illustrates her conceptual distinction between feeling and behavior. Whitney may or may not have understood the abstraction of emotional response. Her answers to questions about anger reflected more behavioral manifestations than pure feeling. To illustrate, following the query, "what do dads think of their daughters when their daughters are angry?" she replied "they'll probably stay out of it and let the moms handle it."

Both girls appeared to distinguish subject from object in their responses. Even when describing episodes of being in trouble, Whitney spoke of her own anger at the situation.

> W: "And I guess it's that that made me mad cause she had said . . . and . . . So I told my grandma that she can pick us up and I told my grandma to come talk to Ms. _____ and it got really heated up because my grandma like started picking on me and stuff, right in front of Ms. ____ and Ms. ____'s like the cause of it."
>
> DC: "What were you maddest about?"
>
> W: "Um, like she embarrassed me in front of everybody . . ."

Whitney appeared to prefer using personal examples rather than generalizing across groups of people when describing people who are angry or reactions of others to them. To questions about how "boys," "girls," or "teachers" feel, she gave the following types of responses.

"When I'm mad at boys . . ."

"They think I'm mean."

"Fine with me, I don't care. I don't want to be around them though."

". . . math teacher, like he feel guilty like . . ."

Bud used personal examples most often in response to Whitney's personal examples. However, she typically began her answers to questions in a generalized fashion. For instance, Bud responds to the question about teachers and angry boys.

B: "I don't know, I guess they just kinda lay off a little bit."

DC: "Lay off?"

B: "Don't mess with them."

DC: "Is that because they're afraid or they just don't know what to do or what?"

B: "They just don't want to do it."

The most poignant individual themes for Whitney involved her descriptions of violent behavior in her immediate family. She experiences physical violence both as witness and direct victim. When she spoke of her own anger toward family members, it was primarily of her own anger with her step-father for his abuse of her mother, whom she tried to protect from both her step-father and her brothers.

W: " . . . my brothers like they get their way and stuff and they just be mad at my mom if they can't do what they want to, so my mom whip them and they try to hit her back and I jump in . . ."

DC: "How does he (dad) make you mad?"

W: "Cause he messes my mom up. And anything. And if he wants us to move, or change the channel or something, to what he wants to watch."

DC: "Sometimes you give in."

W: "Sometimes I don't, but sometimes he's like quiet like he wants to watch something else. He doesn't say anything. I can be mad and I can ignore him. He want to watch the news. I say 'I don't care.' He don't say nothin. My mom can change the channel. He tells her to change the channel when I don't. If my mom tells me to change the channel, I do."

This final excerpt illustrates a phenomenon that apparently took place with relative frequency in Whitney's family. Her mother became a mediator between Whitney and her step-father, a position which may have fostered resentments between the two parents. Whitney's disdain for her step-father had to do with his mistreatment of her mother and became apparent in her passive refusal to acknowledge his wishes. Each of the players in this family situation expressed anger indirectly and (or) violently, perhaps lacking the skills or safety to deal directly and nonviolently with strong emotion.

Bud revealed a pattern of withdrawal and avoidance that she used in her family to deal with anger. This pattern appeared to be a mutual avoidance of address of intense feeling and seemed also to have become an everyday occurrence, amounting to a general style of relating between Bud and her parents.

B: "I don't know, I'm always angry when I'm home so they don't really do anything so I mean they've learned not to ask and I won't tell them anything. They've learned to avoid me and I avoid them and everything works out."

Both girls expressed gender stereotyped expectations for male and female behavior. These expectations appeared to spread across behavior of angry persons and of those perceiving the anger. To illustrate both points, Bud answered the general question "how do dads feel about angry girls?"

B: "Well see if I was a dad and uh I had a daughter that was angry, I'd just kinda stay out of it. But if I had a son that was angry, like with another person you know, like a guy or something, I'd probably encourage them to like go and fight them or something. If it was a daughter, then, I don't know."

DC: "Would you handle it differently somehow?"

B: "Yeah, probably, I don't know, it depends."

DC: "On what?"

B: "On if I was married, or if my wife lived with us."

DC: "Now how would that change things for you, if you were a dad and your daughter was angry? How would that change things for you if you had a wife around?"

B: "Then I'd let her handle it."

This excerpt implies a belief (or an internalization of a belief) that while boys may handle their anger aggressively, girls should not. Reflecting the notion of boys' hostility as desirable, Bud even suggested that a father might coach his son on how to aggressively handle an angry situation with a peer. Further, the passage shows Bud's version of male and female parents' roles in dealing with a girl's anger, Dad as distant, Mom as instrumental.

Another example of gender difference in the handling of strong emotion involved ethnicity as well. Whitney answered a question about possible racial differences as she watched closely for Bud's reaction.

DC: "Let me back up a little bit, going back to the first question, you know I asked you 'how do boys feel about angry girls?' Is it different for white girls and black girls and Hispanic girls? Do they feel differently? What do you think Whitney, you look like you're thinking something."

W: "Oh gosh (laughing and then pausing for quite a while). If a black girl is mad at a black boy, it's probably 50-50 with the boys won't back down and the girls won't back down. They'll just go back and forth. And if they're mad at me, that's their problem."

DC: "Okay, so what about white girls and white boys?"

W: "Oh my goodness (looking at Bud for reaction and laughing)."

DC: "Bud can you answer that?"

B: "All rightey. If a white girl was mad at me (Bud obviously still pretending to be a boy), I'd say well you know, she can handle it. But I think if I was mad at a white girl, I would think that she would think the same thing."

DC: "So you're saying it's the same as with black people that you wouldn't back down? That you'd both kinda be tough about it?"

B: "Depends on the person."

W: "Like if white girls are mad at white boys or white boys are mad at white girls, the girls seem like to give in, like to me."

DC: "What do you mean?"

W: "Like they start to get scared of the boy or whatever, like."

DC: "So the girls give in if they're white?"

W: "Yeah."

DC: "Did you say they give in if they're black, too?"

W: "No (laughing and looking at Bud)."

DC: "Are you afraid Bud's gonna be offended?"

W: "Yeah (both girls laugh)."

As mentioned earlier, another noteworthy individual theme was Bud's decision to pretend she was a boy during our entire interview. When the girls were asked to use pseudonyms for the taping, Bud informed us that she was "not a girl." It was unclear what her conscious motivation was at the time for this transsexual act but it deserves mention that she attempted to take a male's perspective on the majority of the questions discussed.

DC: ". . .what do boys think about angry girls?"

B: "(laughing) Since I'm the guy do I have to answer that?"

DC: "Are you representing the boys?"

B: "Yep."

DC: "What do boys think of angry girls?"

B: "It depends on who they're angry at. I mean if they're angry at you, you don't like them, but if not, I don't think it really matters."

DC: ". . .what do girls think or feel about other girls who are angry? Bud?"

B: "(laughing) I'm not a girl."

DC: ". . . what about your friends that are angry with anybody? Maybe your girl friends that are angry with a teacher or maybe they're angry with their parents or whatever. What do you think of them?"

B: "I associate more with guys."

DC: "Yeah?"

B: "People of my own sex (laughs)."

DC: "What about you Bud? What do moms feel about angry girls?"

B: "Well, if they can't do anything to help it, they probably feel hurt. Maybe. I don't know. I'm not a mom, I'm not a daughter."

Again, on an individual level, Bud appeared to have some sort of disdain for herself as identified as female. Although these comments gave little in the way of explanation for her motivation to use a male identity, they at least suggested some anger at the notion of femininity, especially when considered in light of her previous comments regarding mistrust of females.

Interview Three, Eighth Grade Girl: Morgan

History

Morgan was an eighth-grade, Caucasian, female, the only child of married biological parents, both of whom held college degrees and worked in an upper-level white collar setting. She attended a Montessori academy in the northern region of the city, which seemed to attract applicants from more affluent families. She was extremely articulate and polite, expressing interest in theater arts and music. Morgan had been accepted for enrollment at a high school for the performing arts and will attend there next year.

Morgan was slightly overweight and taller than most of the girls in her eighth grade cohort. She had fair skin, freckles and a warm smile. She wore her long, dark hair twisted into a knot with a barrette behind her head, and she dressed comfortably in jeans and a t-shirt. She moved with a calm determination, almost a stage presence, which stood

in rather sharp contrast to the awkward, self-consciousness of other girls in her age group. Although she was being summoned from her peers, she did not appear shaken or nervous, but serenely gathered her things to join me for the interview.

Interview Themes

Morgan's definition of anger incorporated primarily negative attributes. When asked to define the emotion of anger, she responded "a violent state of mind; a volatile state of being that is more, that can be very negative." Morgan seemed to understand the abstractions of anger and other emotional states as evidenced by her ability to talk about feelings absent of any concrete behavioral attachment. For example, Morgan talked about her father's reaction to her anger.

M: "Yeah, it frustrates me when he doesn't, he doesn't see that I'm angry . . . He thinks I'm exaggerating but a lot of times I'm not."

This passage illustrates her ability to separate emotion from action and grapple with activities that take place internally. Additionally, Morgan demonstrated specific understanding of herself and her own anger in relation to others. This insight included an awareness of the range of emotion that was acceptable to express in her household, and likely consequences of overshooting that range.

M: "Well, generally, I have to be, when someone in the house is emotionally unstable or has some concentration of emotion, you have to be careful what you say or what you do, and with me, if I was angry I might mention something that would strike a nerve with my mom so, I get too angry to

realize that I'm saying it so when I realize I'm getting that angry, I just won't say anything to her. So, cause I don't want, if I get angry, sometimes you don't see and realize what you're doing, so I have to be careful, cause if I don't, I might say something wrong. And my anger will make her angry."

Morgan not only understood that there were limits to the acceptability of her expression, she also described a belief that when she was angry, she became more likely to offend others. Taken a bit further, she felt that her anger catalyzed her mother's anger. In a similar vein, Morgan protected her mother from her own anger by refusing her mother's support when she was feeling the most anger. To illustrate, Morgan responded to further questioning about the acceptable range of anger expression.

DC: "Okay and how much do you, where's the line on what you'll express to her? How do you know how much is too much? How do you know when you've reached that line where she's not going to accept your anger anymore?"

M: "Um, well, it's hard to judge in terms of her accepting my anger. Cause sometimes, she tries to be understanding and sometimes I'm just not receptive to that. If there's something I want like if I'm getting, like if it's really too much and it's really consuming, then I don't want to, I don't want her to have to deal with that. So I'll block it off myself."

Morgan seemed to be saying that at times, she refused support because she saw her anger as distasteful to her mother. As her anger became more intense, she became more likely to

refuse support. Her reference to "blocking it off" may have indicated a disavowal or suppression of affect.

Morgan consistently described feeling diminished or not taken seriously by significant figures when she was angry, as well as a belief that girls' anger was diminished by fathers, boys and teachers. First, she described this phenomenon in relation to her father. When asked to think about the last time she felt really angry, Morgan recounted a story about her and her father getting ready to leave for school in the morning. At the end of her story, she remembered being frustrated and her perception of his feeling toward her.

> M: " . . .And he takes this attitude. He acts like a child, so it's really frustrating he like he's so, and whenever I get upset, he thinks it's funny. He thinks it's amusing. And cause I have a history of being rather dramatic, and they say, he says 'now come on, stop being dramatic' even when I'm serious."

The distance and diminishment Morgan described may reflect confusion as well as feelings of helplessness or ineptitude on the part of those perceiving her. To illustrate, she gave the following continued portrayal of her father.

> M: "My father, he doesn't, if it's something wrong that needs to be talked about, then he'll try to talk about it with me, but generally I avoid that because he's not an easy person to talk with when I'm angry. He doesn't understand a lot of the time. A lot of times, he just doesn't get it, but if it's just anger and he doesn't understand the cause, then he'll just stay away."

Her response to the question "how do boys feel about girls who are angry?" reflected a similar perception.

> M: "Well, a lot of the guys I see, whenever they see a girl's angry, they either say something or do something that would make it worse, or like I said make fun of them, tease them or just avoid them completely. Just stay away, not an appreciation of the anger. I guess they just don't understand it or want to face it."

Morgan saw boys as distancing from other boys' anger out of a certain respect for each other's intense feelings but felt their distance from angry girls came out of confusion or lack of understanding.

> M: "It's different because guys, I guess they realize that other guys are angry, and I guess it's kind of respecting that they give them space but with girls, it's more that they, they don't understand why they are angry so they don't make an effort to try to understand. They don't try to do anything about the anger. They just close themselves off to it."

Similarly, in response to the question "what about teachers and angry girls?" Morgan described the diminishing response.

> M: "Um to me, it seems like teachers and angry girls, they don't take girls seriously. Sometimes they would think it's just for some silly reason, like it may be something serious but the teachers wouldn't see that, male and female teachers. It would just, it would just not even be acknowledged, 'oh they're angry, they'll get over it' kind of a thing."

This contrasted sharply with her descriptions of how girls, mothers, and teachers deal with angry boys. Male anger seemed to carry the threat of violence in Morgan's view. She backed away from angry boys out of fear and expected teachers, especially female teachers, to do the same.

DC: "Okay how do girls feel about boys who are angry?"

M: "Well, I think, me when I see guys that are angry, I feel like it could scare me cause boys are, can get very violent when they're mad and generally I try to stay away."

DC: "So girls get scared."

M: "Yeah, cause you don't know if they'll lash out at you or not."

M: "I would say the mother's trying to help. I would think they'd be more cautious with the guys, just like we are."

DC: "Finally, how do teachers feel about boys who are angry?"

M: "Teachers don't want to deal with you when you're angry. And I think it's a scary thing."

DC: "They're scared?"

M: "Yeah, and like I said before, you don't know what they're going to do and if the teacher doesn't have enough control over the student then they're not going to deal with it . . . well, generally if a boy is angry, and

he's doing something wrong in class, the teacher will, is more likely to let it slide and not stir it up or anything and not give the boy any cause to be any more angry than that."

DC: "Oh, so kind of ignoring it, hoping it will go away?"

M: "Go away. I've seen that happen."

DC: "And is that the same for male teachers and female teachers or is it different?"

M: "I think the male teachers, they're a little more, they're a little less likely to back down. Maybe they'll try at a certain point to control a kid, I don't know. I'm thinking, I'm not thinking out-of-control boy here. But I think they'll try harder to keep a cap on their anger. Instead of female teachers because female teachers would just not, not bother themselves but they wouldn't try to do anything about it and if it got to a really bad point, nothing would be done. But if it got to a bad point with the male teachers, then they would maybe take a stand. They wouldn't let the anger take advantage of the class."

Finally, Morgan expressed her own surprise at hearing her descriptions of gender bias in people's reactions to anger in boys and in girls. She reflected upon the answers she'd given during the course of the interview and made the following comment.

M: "Well, as I'm listening to what I'm saying, it seems kind of, ancient. These are ideas that are making themselves known but it seems very

real. But when I look at it as a second person, it's not, it sounds really antiquated, you know. It's just ideas and thoughts that we thought had gone out the door, but you know, when I'm there saying these things, it makes perfect sense. But if I'm looking at me looking at it, it's very unusual."

Interview Four: Angel & Angelica

History

Angelica is an eleven-year-old, Hispanic fifth grader who presents as very thoughtful and somewhat reserved, her dark round eyes watching honestly behind large, thick glasses. She is the older of two siblings, with a younger brother in pre-school. Her mother works at home while her father works in construction management. Angelica typically defers to Angel when questions are presented to both girls, but readily speaks her mind when she disagrees with an answer her friend has given. Her verbal style is direct to the point, but she remains very quiet during most of the interview. She is dressed casually in jeans but sports some more classically feminine accessories like white eyelet lace trim on her denim shirt and a gold locket around her neck, her long hair hanging straight and loose.

Angel, also an eleven-year-old fifth grader, is Caucasian, the oldest of two siblings in an intact nuclear family in which both parents work outside the home in upper-level blue collar positions. Her small, wiry build matches her quick, verbal style, as she seems to say exactly what strikes her in each moment, without fretting over her words. Angel often

appears suddenly in any part of the school building, her small, determined face looking up to ask me when I will come to take her out of class. Her appearance, albeit somewhat unkempt, matches her busy, no-nonsense manner, with sandy hair cropped off at her shoulders and very casual, almost nondescript clothing. Angel's younger brother attends the same public Montessori academy where the two girls are enrolled, a school located in the southern part of the city, attracting applicants from a wide variety of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. Angel and Angelica are together in a fourth through sixth grade class reputed to be "wild" and somewhat emotionally immature.

Interview Themes

Unlike in the three previous interviews, these girls seemed to have more difficulty distinguishing between anger or emotion as an abstraction and more concrete, behavioral manifestations of feeling. For almost every query about feelings, Angel and Angelica consistently applied action-based illustrations to talk about their perceptions. For example, Angelica offered this description of how she knows when she's angry.

DC: "And so when you get really mad, what happens to you? How do you know you're mad?"

AL: (laughs nervously, shrugging)

AA: "I know when I get mad, I crumble up paper."

DC: "You crumble up paper?"

AA: "That helps me get rid of it."

However, although this passage shows Angelica's attempt to explain anger using concrete

behavior, she did appear to understand a relationship between doing something physically, and feeling a release of the more intangible emotion. Angelica also seemed to understand suppression as she described her response to a particular female peer.

AA: " . . .she makes me want to hit people but I just hold it inside."

This response continues to illustrate Angelica's tendency to explain feelings in behavioral terms. The idea of a particular behavior, in this case "hitting people," was used as a marker for Angelica in determining her own feeling. The following excerpt follows a question regarding how boys feel about angry girls and shows more of this stylistic issue.

DC: "Okay so how do those boys feel about the girls when they notice the the girls are angry? When the boys see you balling up your fist or crumbling up the paper or whatever you do."

AA: "They're gonna be 'uh-oh.'"

DC: "What does that mean?"

AL: "They're gonna beat you up (laughs)."

DC: "Hm, do you think boys think they're gonna get beat up?"

AL: "Can, can we say their names?"

DC: "Sure, I'll bleep it out."

AL & AA: (whisper to each other in consultation about what to say)

AL: "___ and there's also a boy in my class named . . . Jeff, yeah, Jeff (laughs about her disguise of boy's name). And you say like 'be quiet Jeff' (laughs) and he'll say 'whatcha gonna do about it, I'll break

every jaw in your body.'"

AA: "I'll break every jaw in your body?"

DC: "That's what Jeff says?" (AL: "Uh-huh.") "What do you say?"

AL: "I say 'yeah, whatever' (laughs) and I'll say 'I only have one jaw.'"

DC: "So what does Jeff think of you when you're angry with him?"

AL: "Hm, I don't know."

The previous passage continues to demonstrate Angel's and Angelica's use of external behaviors to describe or understand internal feeling. The dialogue also points out a possible tendency to confuse subject and object when relating stories about anger. It is unclear whether Angel is telling about "Jeff's" anger toward her primarily, or if she truly understands "Jeff" to be responding to her anger with him. The final query attempts to make this clear, but Angel seems constrained in maneuvering around the intangible of how "Jeff" feels about her anger. This combination of ideas may be too abstract for her to comprehend, instead leaving her to recall the peer's anger toward her.

Whether or not Angel understands the abstraction in question here, her answer reflects an ongoing theme in these two fifth-graders' interpersonal repertoire. Regardless of the sex of persons being described, both girls speak continually of anger as violence. In fact, their definitions of anger seem to reflect a belief that anger and violence are inextricably joined.

DC: "How do you two define anger, what's your definition? What's your best dictionary definition of anger? You can make something up."

AL: "I feel like throwing something."

AA: "When you beat somebody."

AL: "Feel like throwing something across the room."

DC: "A violent feeling?"

AL & AA: "Yeah!"

DC: "Like an urge to do something . . ."

AL: "Bad, exactly."

DC: "Do you think of bad things when you think of anger?"

AA: "Uh-huh."

DC: "Do you ever think of good things when you think of anger?"

AL: "No, no, yes, well, think of beating that person up."

Angel and Angelica generally did not distinguish between anger and aggression. Nearly every episode of anger between boys and girls recalled involves some element of violence or threat thereof. Often, stories of peer interactions include an apparent squaring off or threatening/posturing ritual that seems equally likely for males and females.

DC: "Have you seen him ("Jeff") when you get angry?" (AL: "Uh-huh.") "How does he change? Do you think he's afraid of you or do you think he laughs at you or . . .

AL: "He's probably afraid but he acts like he's not afraid because he's afraid uh Henry (laughs) and uh Lee (laughs again at disguised names) will, they're in fifth grade, and he tries to cover it up so they won't

think he's a wimp (laughs). And that's what he really, that's what he does."

DC: "He's afraid but he doesn't want the boys to know it."

AA: "He wants the boys to think that he's tough and stuff."

DC: "Well that's interesting. So how does he actually act?"

AL: "He'll say 'what you gonna do about it' and he'll hit us and . . ."

AA: "And then we'll run at him and he runs away . . ."

In general, Angel and Angelica recall both boys and girls using violence or verbal assault to express anger and handle intense interpersonal situations. They also appear to hold fighting ability up as a standard by which to judge the overall social worth of both male and female peers.

AL: "Like there's this girl in our uh, Leeanne (laughs at disguised name). She's a really tough girl and she's already beated up a couple of people in our classroom and ____ will say something and she'll say 'what did you say?' And it'll be like 'oh nothing' but they really do say something."

AL: "Well, I don't think they're afraid of Jeff, well Lee might be afraid of Henry but he admits that he can beat him up so he's not scared to admit it."

AA: "Like, Deann, yeah and Henry (laughs). Like Henry, he'll call her names and Deann will get up in his face and he won't do nothing. He'll back off

because he knows that she could beat him up. Like he talks under his breath."

AL: "If they say 'you know you can't beat nobody up' I'll say 'you can't judge what you don't know' and 'you don't know I can't beat anybody up if you haven't seen anybody . . .'"

Although these examples reflect a sort of gender neutrality with regard to use of aggression, Angel and Angelica denigrate another female who seems to bully both girls and boys with relative frequency. This example follows Angelica's remarking that she thinks "girls get angry more."

AL: ". . . because Luke beat up Sandra because she thinks she can beat up anybody she wants and she'll go up in your face and she'll bother you and she'll call you punk if you don't play . . ."

This same female peer becomes an icon for aggressive behavior that deserves punishment. Though aggression is encouraged and used regularly as a defense or tool for resolving conflict, certain girls' aggressive behavior is met with disdain.

AA: ". . .I mean Sandra was playing with Blanca and uh (AL: "Luke."), yeah Luke and Luke was playing with Sandra and uh you know taking off their glasses and trying them on and he ran back and gave them to her and she hit him . . .(AL: "And they started a big fight.") They started a big fight and she thought she could beat him and she only got like three hits off of him and she was like on the ground and he was like

hurting her (both girls laugh)."

DC: "Is that unusual for girls to be . . ."

AA: "Yeah they think that they're all that and they can beat up anybody they want and then watch them get beat up."

Angelica seemed to be denigrating girls' aggressive behavior while simultaneously suggesting it as a commonly used tool for handling intense feeling. The insult, here directed at a female peer, appeared particularly salient when an individual overestimated his or her ability to "beat up" the opponent. Angelica gave at least the implication of satisfaction about her female peer's defeat.

Angelica expressed the belief that girls become angry more often than boys, basing her opinion on the events described in the previous passage. However, later in the interview Angel asserted that boys, not girls, were expected to suppress their anger most of the time.

DC: "What about moms and angry boys? How do they feel about angry boys?"

AL: "Probably the same way but a little bit worse, cause I heard that boys were supposed to hold their temper."

DC: "Really, what do you mean?"

AL: "Like they're not supposed to lose their temper."

AA: "You know how girls hold it for awhile and . . .go off and start saying stuff but boys are supposed to hold it in."

The girls seemed to be suggesting that suppression gives rise to some kind of expression on the part of females. If "go off" implied volatility as it seemed, they could be describing a form of explosiveness brought about by a period of suppression. In their construal, such a release was not acceptable for males, an idea that appears inconsistent with many of their actual descriptions of angry boys. They may, however, have been distinguishing between angry behavior in which a boy immediately displays his feeling, and the phenomenon of suppression to a point of inevitable release. The latter has been stereotypically associated with females for these two girls, as a rather pejorative light is cast on girls' expression of anger in this scenario. In the next passage, Angel and Angelica again appeared to equate anger with some kind of aggressive behavior, although it is not clearly articulated. Both girls laugh disdainfully at boys' angry behavior, calling it "typical."

DC: " . . . what do girls think of boys that are angry?"

AL: "They think they're just trying to act bad."

AA: "Yeah, trying to act typical (laughs)."

These girls denigrate the self-aggrandizing behavior often described in relation to those who are angry. When such behavior is attached to the self, it is described in terms of self-defense and legitimate conflict resolution. When attached to other girls, the "showing off" behavior is seen as negative, especially if the girl demonstrates the self-confidence to carry out her aggressive threats. When attached to boys, such behavior is ridiculed but expected. There is no specific attack on self confidence in Angel and Angelica's characterization of aggressive boys.

Finally, another gender-related twist in the interview with Angel and Angelica involved their portrait of girls as more at-risk than boys for getting into troublesome situations. This portrayal also suggested a misunderstanding of one of the interview questions.

DC: ". . .Do you think moms get scared of boys or girls more than the other when they're angry?"

AL: "Probably girls."

DC: "Do you think they're scared of girls more?"

AA: ". . .should I say it, yeah."

AL: "Can I say something?"

DC: "Sure."

AA: "You're not gonna get mad (laughs)?"

DC: "I doubt it."

AL: "Girls can turn out to be, they can grow up and have babies and girls can go out and get drunk and boys can like take them to the (AA: "To the hotel.") yeah, and they'll get really scared that they're gonna get beat up and shot and get pregnant on accident."

DC: "Oh, okay, so moms get scareder for their girls than they do for their boys."

AA: "Yeah cause boys can't run out and get pregnant."

Again, it appears the girls have confused a directionality of emotion states, substituting "scared of" with "scared for." This confusion may reflect their level of cognitive development and an inability to think abstractly, which parallels their reliance on concrete, behavioral illustrations to express their thoughts on anger. Nonetheless, Angel and Angelica view females as more vulnerable than their male counterparts to having adversity imposed upon them.

Themes Across-Interviews

Anger, General

To continue orienting the reader to this particular cross-interview analysis, certain adjustments to girls' actual words were necessary to convey meanings. Some categories of responses made by girls during the four interviews were reworded to reflect more standard adult English. Similarly, in reporting themes across interviews, many of the investigator's own labels and interpretations were attached to noted trends. Table 3 shows a listing of all codes used for designation of behaviors mentioned by girls on the parts of boys, girls and those perceiving them, along with a brief explanation of their meaning.A defining trend in the overall collection of responses was that responses to questions generally fell within the following categories: (1) behaviors of angry girls, (2) behaviors of angry boys, (3) behaviors of individuals perceiving angry girls, (4) behaviors of individuals perceiving angry boys, (5) feelings of individuals perceiving angry girls, (6) feelings of individuals perceiving angry boys, (7) perceptions/opinions of individuals perceiving angry girls, and (8) perceptions/opinions of individuals perceiving angry boys.

Table 3

Response codes with definitions from content analysis.

code	meaning	definition
ANGRY BEHAVIORS:		
SO	somatization	expression of emotion through physiological symptom
RE	refusal to eat	avoidance of food
NZ	neutralization	attempts to negate or render inoperative internal feeling
SU	suppression	attempts to subdue or restrict internal feeling
UL	urge to express, general	feeling a need to openly manifest emotion/opinion
NV	nonverbal expression	some form of open manifestation of feeling not involving spoken words; nonvolatile
RT	refusal to talk	avoidance of speaking
WI	withdrawal	avoiding people with whom usually associated
WB	withdrawal/girls to boys	avoiding female peers; associating with males instead
UV	urge to express, verbal	feeling a need to manifest emotion/opinion with spoken words
PV	passive verbal expression	using spoken words to manifest feeling/opinion; not directed openly to intended target
SH	sharing/nonvolatile	attempting mutual exchange of feeling/opinion
VA	verbal aggression	volatile use of spoken words to openly manifest feeling/ opinion; directed at target in threatening or insulting manner
WV	volatile withdrawal	removal of self from other in openly explosive manner
FA	feigned aggression	acting as if about to use violence against other
AI	acting on inanimate	acting explosively toward a nonliving object
AG	aggression	use of violence against other
VE	volatile verbal expression	explosive use of spoken words to openly manifest feeling/ opinion; directed at target in nonthreatening, noninsulting manner
BEHAVIORS OF THOSE PERCEIVING GIRLS' AND BOYS' ANGER:		
EX	explaining	offering reasons for the person's anger
CO	coaching	teaching or encouraging the person to aggress
TE	teaching	offering a lesson to be learned about the anger
RD	ridiculing	insulting the angry person
DM	diminishing	downplaying the person's anger and the reasons for it

Table 3 (Contd.)

Response codes with definitions from content analysis (Contd.).

code	meaning	definition
JD	judging	giving indictment about person's correctness or incorrectness
PT	pathologizing	giving negatively diagnostic statement about person
PN	punishing	inflicting penalty upon person
AG	aggressing	using violence against person
CT	controlling	attempting to direct the behavior of the person
SP	supporting	offering encouragement or understanding to the person
LY	leniency	absence of punishment; overlooking transgression
RS	respecting	displaying nonjudgmental attitude toward the person
EX	exploring	encouraging the person to talk about their feelings
DS	distancing	avoiding the person; putting literal space between self and the person
IG	ignoring	acting as if not noticing (hearing, seeing) the person

Girls across the four structured interviews gave the following as reasons for their own anger: being humiliated in front of peers, being betrayed by friends with regard to confidences told, death in the family, illness in the family, being teased or ridiculed, being in trouble with their parents, and being ignored by their female friends who were angry. "Refusal to talk" was the most commonly stated behavior of girls when angry, followed by "withdrawal." The third and fourth most commonly stated angry behaviors of girls were "volatile verbal expression" and "nonverbal expression," respectively (see Table 4). Girls reported the most common angry behavior of boys to be "aggression." Only

"verbal aggression" and "feigned aggression" were mentioned in addition to aggression with regard to boys' behaviors when angry (see Table 5).

Angry behaviors attributed to girls tended to be internalizing behaviors overall. In other words, the behaviors girls admitted using when they were angry, or those reported for other angry girls, were not usually actions taken on the environment to change something undesirable. They tended instead to be actions taken on or within the self (as in the case of "neutralization" and "refusal to eat") or passive expressions made with regard to others which effectively distanced the angry girl from people in her immediate support system (as in the case of "refusal to talk," "nonverbal expression," and "withdrawal").

Most of the internalizing behaviors mentioned by girls contain some element of action taken on the self, as if to adapt the self to fit demands of the social context. The fourth interview yielded behaviors for girls which did not fit this overall pattern. Rather, this group of fifth grade girls reported primarily "aggression," "feigned aggression" and "volatile verbal expression" as means for girls to express anger (primarily other girls). These behaviors appeared to be more externalizing in nature because they involved actions taken on the environment with the apparent intent of changing something undesirable.

Table 4

Frequencies of Angry Behaviors of Girls

(1) **SO**	(3) **RE**	(6) **NZ**	(4) **SU**	(6) **UL**	(7) **NV**
(13) **RT**	(11) **WI**	(2) **WB**	(1) **WV**	(9) **VE**	(5) **FA**
(2) **UV**	(0) **PV**	(1) **SH**	(1) **AI**	(2) **VA**	(5) **AG**

INT = Internalizing Behavior **EXT** = Externalizing Behavior

SO - Somatization
RE - Refusal to Eat
NZ - Neutralization
SU - Suppression
UL - Urge to Express, General
NV - Nonverbal Expression
RT - Refusal to Talk
WI - Withdrawal
WB - Withdrawal from Girls to Boys

VA - Verbal Aggression
WV - Volatile Withdrawal
FA - Feigned Aggression
UV - Urge to Express, Verbal
PV - Passive Verbal Expression
SH - Sharing, Nonvolatile
AI - Acting on Inanimate
VE - Volatile Verbal Expression
AG - Aggression

Table 5

Frequencies of Angry Behaviors of Boys

(0) SO	(0) RE	(0) NZ	(0) SU	(0) UL	(0) NV
(0) RT	(0) WI	(0) WB	(1) WV	(0) VE	(1) FA
(0) UV	(0) PV	(0) SH	(0) AI	(3) VA	(11) AG

INT

EXT

INT = Internalizing Behavior **EXT** = Externalizing Behavior

SO - Somatization
RE - Refusal to Eat
NZ - Neutralization
SU - Suppression
UL - Urge to Express, General
NV - Nonverbal Expression
RT - Refusal to Talk
WI - Withdrawal
WB - Withdrawal from Girls to Boys

VA - Verbal Aggression
WV - Volatile Withdrawal
FA - Feigned Aggression
UV - Urge to Express, Verbal
PV - Passive Verbal Expression
SH - Sharing, Nonvolatile
AI - Acting on Inanimate
VE - Volatile Verbal Expression
AG - Aggression

For angry boys, girls tended to report primarily externalizing behaviors. However, girls gave far fewer examples of behaviors for boys than for girls in general. When they did supply reports of boys' angry behaviors, they only mentioned "aggression," "verbal aggression," "volatile withdrawal," and "feigned aggression." Again, these behaviors appeared to be primarily externalizing in nature due to their action on the environment versus the self. However, "volatile withdrawal" appeared to combine the elements of internalization and externalization, having a distancing effect between boys and their social supports and a somewhat aggressive, acting out effect as well.

Across interviews, two primary issues arose with regard to the construct of anger in general. First, all interviewees expressed having a definition of anger which was primarily negative in nature. Of the eighteen behaviors mentioned for angry boys and girls, only four indicate desire or skills for proactive work toward conflict-resolution or positive environmental change ("urge to express, general," "urge to express, verbal," "sharing, nonvolatile," and "volatile verbal expression"). The majority of girls' descriptions of angry behavior involved either problematic internalization ("somatization," "refusal to eat," "suppression," "neutralization," and "withdrawal") or problematic externalization ("aggression," "verbal aggression," and "feigned aggression").

Somewhat consistent with this pattern, girls tended to give negative examples of behavior on the parts of those perceiving angry boys and girls. Appendix D contains figures summarizing the described behaviors, feelings and opinions held or demonstrated

by those perceiving angry boys and girls. These depicted behaviors, feelings, and opinions are listed along with frequencies of their mention by girls during interviews.

Of the eighteen behaviors mentioned for girls, boys, moms, dads, and teachers perceiving anger, only seven implied potential positive acknowledgment of the anger ("explaining," "coaching," "teaching," "supporting," "leniency," "respecting," and "exploring," see Appendix D, Figure 1). Seven clearly involved negative acknowledgment ("judging," "pathologizing," "punishing," "aggressing," "verbal aggression," "stifling," and "controlling"). Four involved some refusal to acknowledge the person's anger, with an accompanying negative gesture ("ridiculing," "diminishing," "distancing," and "ignoring").

Similarly, girls described seven different opinions perceiving individuals might have of angry boys and girls, all of which implicate the angry person with some generally undesirable quality. Described opinions were as follows: "angry person as coward," "angry person as self-aggrandizing," "angry person as crazy," "angry person as stupid," "angry person as petty," "angry person as mean," and "angry person as overdramatizing" (see Appendix D, Figure 2).

In contrast, many of the feelings girls thought to be experienced by those perceiving boys' and girls' anger indicated positive affiliation. These feelings included "sadness," "pity," "concern," "guilt," and "helplessness-ineptitude," all of which implied some degree of interdependence and (or) caring between perceiver and perceived (see Appendix D, Figure 3). In other words, perceiving a boy or girl as angry and experiencing one of the above feelings implied not only an acknowledgment of the anger, but an

empathic reaction or desire to help as well. The feelings of "amusement," "neutrality," "confusion," "fear," "anger," and "offense," also described by these girls, could have existed in a positive affiliation but did not imply the same degree of empathy or desire to help the angry person.

Second, without exception, all interviewees associated the idea of anger with violence in some way. These two themes were explicitly stated by Morgan and by Angel and Angelica while being implicitly expressed in the first two interviews. For most of the girls, this association came primarily when referring to boys' anger, although for Angel and Angelica, the connection was expressed equally for both males and females.

DC: "How do you feel about boys who are angry?"

CA: "I do the thing she does, I run away."

M: "Well, I think, me when I see guys that are angry, I feel like it could scare me cause boys are, can get very violent when they're mad and so generally I try to stay away."

The younger groups each expressed the notion that anger is somehow punishable by parents, or becomes punished by parents. Both younger groups perceived anger as a punishable offense, whether or not aggression is its means of communication.

DC: "What do moms think of girls who are angry?"

CL, DE: "Whoa, man, lord . . .!"

DE: "They say 'what's wrong with you?' and they'll go in there and get

the belt and run all around the house."

Two of the groups reported violence in their families associated with anger. Group one, the fifth grade group of Cassandra, Deborah, and Clementine and group two, the eighth grade group of Whitney and Bud were either witnesses or direct victims of some form of family violence.

CL: "Like my brother he'll start trying to fight me and I'll just kick back but . . ."

W: ". . . no he (dad) whip them (brothers). Sometimes they just run him over down the door. They open it and go . . ."

Gender Issues

With regard to boys' anger, several themes emerged across interviews. First, common to all four interviews, girls of both grades either directly reported or indirectly implied feeling fear, or responding in a fearful manner, to boys' anger. "Fear" was, in fact, the most commonly given feeling response for girls in relation to angry boys (see Appendix D). All four interviews yielded the perception that boys' anger is associated with aggression. So, whether girls directly expressed fearing angry boys or not, they identified boys' anger with violence in some form. Even in cases where girls' anger was also tied to aggression, boys were given a comparatively larger share of violence-proneness in these girls' evaluations. Girls' most commonly perceived behaviors of boys in response to other boys' anger was "aggressing," with "verbal aggression," "distancing," and "respecting" also mentioned (see Table 5). "Fear" and "neutrality" were the only feeling responses

mentioned for boys perceiving other boys who are angry, both tending towards less positive affiliation (see Appendix D, Figure 3).

AA: "Well, you know girls that like try to walk up to you and start something and get in your face and boys will be trying to start problems.

DC: "Girls will be . . ."

AL: "Girls will be trying to get in your face and act - but boys will just start fighting."

The most common behavior of girls in response to angry boys was some form of "distancing," with "ridicule" and "aggression" being the only other behaviors described (see Appendix D, Figure 1). However, the distancing behaviors described by these girls usually had to do with self-defense against real or imagined violence on the part of the angry boy. All behaviors mentioned for girls in response to angry boys involved either negative acknowledgment or refusal to acknowledge boys' anger. Most often, girls mentioned having the opinion of an angry boy as "stupid" (see Appendix D, Figure 2).

Second, boys' anger was perceived to be coached by fathers. In other words, girls of both grade groupings believed that dads encourage their sons to aggress against peers with whom they are angry. While the only feeling responses mentioned for dads in relation to angry boys were "sadness," "anger," and "neutrality" (see Appendix D, Figure 3), the most commonly stated behavioral response of fathers perceiving their sons to be angry was "coaching" (see Appendix D, Figure 1).

AA: "They, they, they say 'did you beat him up?' My dad would. My dad

and my little brother. He'll go 'so did you slug him like I told you to?'"

AL: "My brother, they'll get in little boy fights and you know they'll go 'kick you where it hurts,' and he'll go out there and punch him in the nose."

Moms were thought to use "supporting" and "leniency" most often in response to boys' anger (see Appendix D, Figure 1), with the most common feeling reported to be "fear" (see Appendix D, Figure 3). Also mentioned were the feeling responses of "anger," "neutrality," "sadness," and "pity." Boys' anger was thought by girls in the eighth grade to be largely ignored by teachers. Some form of "distancing" was the most commonly stated behavioral response of teachers to angry boys, with "leniency," "punishment," and "control" mentioned as well (see Appendix D, Figure 1). The only feeling responses mentioned for teachers with regard to angry boys were "fear" and "neutrality" (see Appendix D, Figure 3). As illustrated previously, reasons for teachers to overlook boys' anger included fear of provoking the boys to violence and lack of motivation to deal with the anger.

Further, boys were characterized by younger girls as intimidated by both boys' and girls' anger, but using aggression as a front for their fear.

DC: "What do boys think of other boys when they're angry?"

DE: "The same thing."

CL: "They think of their fists."

DC: "They think of their fists?"

DE: "They be like 'what's up man' and they be running into each other and . . ."

DC: "So you think they're more aggressive with each other when they . . .

CL: "When they talk about each other they act like they're gonna fight each other."

CA: "But turns out that they're both wimpy."

Girls of both grade groups reported that boys would tease them when they're angry or diminish the seriousness of the issue at hand. However, the most commonly stated feeling response for boys with regard to angry girls was "fear" (see Appendix D, Figure 3). Also mentioned were the feelings of "neutrality," and "confusion," all three feelings tending towards less positive affiliation. Opinions most often stated for boys with regard to angry girls were "coward" and "crazy" (see Appendix D, Figure 2). Boys were seen by both older and younger girls to distance themselves from girls when the girls were angry or to ignore them. "Distancing" was the most commonly stated behavioral response for boys perceiving angry girls, and all behaviors mentioned in this regard involved either a negative acknowledgment or a refusal to acknowledge girls' anger (see Appendix D, Figure 1).

M: "Well, a lot of the guys I see, whenever they see a girl's angry, they . . . like I said make fun of them, tease them . . .

DC: "Okay, so what did the boys think of you for being mad?"

DE: "They thought we were wimpy and stuff."

CA: "They just ignored us and stuff."

With regard to girls' anger, the most common feeling perceived for dads in response to angry girls was "concern," with "pity," "amusement," "neutrality," "helplessness-ineptitude," and "confusion" mentioned as well (see Appendix D, Figure 3). Dads were most often said to think of angry daughters as "overdramatizing" (see Appendix D, Figure 2). In contrast to the coaching perceived to occur in the case of boys' anger, dads were perceived as diminishing or distancing from anger in girls. By far, the most commonly stated behavioral response of dads to angry girls was "distancing" (see Appendix D). Across all four interviews, in relation to angry girls, dads were portrayed as distant while moms were instrumental. However, moms supported only to a point, then became angry or even punished when a girl was angry. The most commonly stated behavior of moms was "punish" in response to girls' anger, while by far the most common feeling reported for moms was "anger." Moms were characterized by the older girls as feeling hurt or taking personal offense when a girl was angry and not soothed by her (mom's) support. Girls made frequent mention of their refusal to be comforted by moms and of their own nonverbal gestures of distance at these times.

Their accounts of relating to their fathers seemed a bit different from accounts of relating to mothers. Even in the case of the first interview, where dads were characterized as "pitying" girls, their pitying behavior seemed to diminish the real issues behind the girls' anger. Dads offered comments such as "that's okay, she ain't gonna do it no more right?" which appeared to support the girl in such a situation. In fact, dads were seen as rescuing

girls from their mothers' punishing gestures at times when girls were angry. Examined differently however, such comments failed to address girls' real feelings, and instead overlooked issues fostering the anger, shrinking the girl's legitimacy as it diminished her culpability. Dads were also contrasted with moms in their instrumentality, where moms were seen as involved but disabled, dads as distant yet powerful. Girls credited their fathers with having a potency to deal with intense circumstances, yet deferring responsibility for emotional issues to mothers, due to feelings of ineptitude, confusion, or a wish to avoid.

DE: "He'll say 'don't whip that girl,' she ain't done nothing that bad . . ."

M: "Well, my mother generally is - when she sees me upset or angry, she wants to talk to me about it . . . she tries to help. But sometimes if I'm angry with myself or too angry, then she picks up on that and gets mad too . . ."

CL: "But she say stuff like 'I guess you got a boyfriend' and stuff like that, and I like 'no' like that and I roll my eyes and she get like kinda mad . . ."

Across both age groups girls talked about having an urge to express their anger verbally to their mothers. Although this appears to contradict the previous examples of

girls' refusal of maternal support, it may reflect continued desire to relate emotionally with their mothers despite the threat of adverse consequences.

CL: "Like if we talking about, under our breath, and our mama over there, whooo!

DE: "We better run! She come after you with a belt."

DC: "That's how you deal with it when you're mad at your mom, you talk under your breath and then she gets even more mad?" (DE: "Uh-huh.")

CA: "Sometimes you just gotta tell her."

Girls across both age groups felt teachers tried to be supportive of them when they were angry but at some point considered the girls' anger to be petty or unimportant. Girls in two groups recalled their own refusal of this teacher support, but one in particular, only after noticing the teacher's condescension. The most commonly stated teacher behaviors with regard to girls' anger was "supporting," with "diminishing" close behind (see Appendix D, Figure 1). Also mentioned were the behaviors of "teaching," "punishing," "controlling," and "leniency." The most commonly stated feeling response for teachers to angry girls was "concern," with "neutrality," "guilt," and "anger" also mentioned (see Appendix D). The opinion thought to be held by teachers of angry girls most often was "petty" (see Appendix D, Figure 2).

Younger girls vilified the aggressive behavior of other angry girls. They also showed disdain for their female peers who engaged in gender-atypical behavior, especially when it involved an overconfidence in their ability to use violence. Their most commonly

held opinion of other angry girls was "self-aggrandizing" (see Appendix D, Figure 2).

AL: "She walks around like all that. She goes around putting her hands in people's faces, just acts weird."

CL: "She thinks she can fight everybody." (DC: "Oh?")

DE: "She thinks she's going to win too."

DC: "And do you think she's going to win or . . ."

CL, CA, DE: "No! (laugh)"

However, girls of both grade groups expressed the belief that girls do support each other when one is angry. Girls' most commonly stated behavior in response to other girls' anger was "supporting," with "respecting," "exploring," "diminishing," "distancing," "judging," "aggressing," and "verbal aggression" also mentioned (see Appendix D, Figure 1). Girls mentioned feeling "sadness," "neutrality," and "anger" in response to other girls' anger (see Appendix D, Figure 3).

DE: "When she gets mad, she don't talk to nobody in the classroom and we be like 'Clementine why you won't eat' and she won't eat . . ."

M: "Generally, the girls will understand and support you and work it out. Or if you're just beyond that and if you just want to be left alone kind of thing, then they'll respect that and they'll back off."

Summary of Themes Within and Across Interviews

To summarize, both within and across the four structured interviews, several themes arose which appeared relevant to anger and girls' perceptions of themselves and others. In terms of general anger issues, girls held negative overall definitions of anger, associating it most often with violence and other destructive ideas. Most of the girls interviewed appeared able to conceptualize anger in an abstract form although quite a few of them seemed to confuse anger towards others with anger from others, directed at themselves. Especially with regard to parents, girls had more difficulty conceptualizing their own anger towards caregivers versus being the target of caregivers' anger. One group of fifth graders had difficulty using anger as an abstract concept, instead supplying examples of concrete behavior to define the issue. This group relied on examples of violent or aggressive behavior in most cases to illustrate their own or others' anger.

Anger within the girls' families was portrayed in a variety of ways. Several households were reported to be scenes of violence during periods of anger between family members. Several instances of corporal punishment were recalled, some in response to girls' expressions of anger. Girls often expressed the notion of anger as being punished by parents, especially younger girls, and most significantly in relation to their mothers. In contrast, one eighth grader remarked about a pattern of overall avoidance that had developed between her and her parents. Since she related that she was "always angry" when at home, the mutual avoidance did not appear more marked at certain times than at others.

Several gender-related issues emerged both within and across interviews with regard to anger. First, girls associated boys' anger with more violence proneness than their own. Conversely, when describing their own or female peers' anger, some form of withdrawal behavior was usually mentioned. Although both males and females were seen as capable of aggression, boys' anger was judged to be more physically dangerous than girls.' This perception resulted in their overall fear of boys' anger. Most of the girls interviewed expressed feeling scared of boys' anger, often distancing from angry boys out of a need for safety or self-defense. However, one African American eighth grader noticed a difference in black and white girls' behaviors when angry, with black girls more likely to defend themselves against boys and white girls more likely to "back down" in relation to boys. Boys' aggression was thought to be coached or promoted by fathers when it was directed at peers. The violence attributed to boys was often characterized by younger girls as a smokescreen for fear. In other words, girls perceived boys to be afraid of girls' anger, or afraid of a loss of reputation should they refrain from aggressing.

Fear of boys' aggression was perceived to extend to mothers and female teachers as well. Both mothers and female teachers were portrayed as backing down, being lenient or ignoring the anger of boys, so as not to provoke additional wrath. Teachers of either sex were characterized as often ignoring or backing away from angry boys simply for lack of motivation to deal with their intense feelings. Girls felt their anger was diminished or seen as unimportant by teachers of both sexes. However, when teachers were perceived as supportive, girls often related instances of their own refusal of that support.

Girls generally felt ridiculed, teased or pathologized by boys when they (girls) were angry. Both older and younger girls felt ignored and diminished in their anger by boys and fathers. Boys and fathers were also seen to distance themselves from angry girls for reasons including confusion and fear. Dads were seen as distancing from angry girls in deference to mothers, giving the female parent responsibility for handling intense feelings of the female child.

Girls perceived their mothers as playing a more instrumental role in dealing with feelings of both boys and girls, especially the latter. They more often than not saw their mothers as likely to support them during times of anger but as also likely to become angry with them and (or) punish their anger. Girls expressed the notion that their mothers likely tried to help when they (girls) were angry but became offended or hurt when their efforts did not immediately reduce girls' anger. Girls talked about feeling an urge to verbally express their anger to their mothers but often using some form of passive expression instead.

These girls spoke in derogatory terms about their female peers who used aggression to express anger, although one group of fifth grade girls freely admitted threatening with and using such means of communication themselves. Generally, however, when a female peer was aggressive and confident about her ability to use violence, she became a target for these girls' criticism. Younger girls also disparaged behavior of other girls which seemed to defy certain rules of gender-appropriateness, including dress, peer-association, aggression, initiation of romantic involvement, and academic performance.

Wearing "boy clothes," playing with boys at recess, asking a boy to "go with" one, and lacking parental pressure to make good grades were all given as examples of things not generally seen in girls. In most cases, use of aggression, as well as confidence or overconfidence in one's ability to do so appeared connected with these girls' notions of gender-atypicality as well.

Overall, these fifth and eighth grade girls spoke of their female cohorts as generally supportive with each other's anger, although there were some statements of apathy in this regard. When girls were well acquainted, they tended to ask questions about their friends' feelings and withdrawal or self-destructive behavior. Gender-typical behavior for angry girls included a refusal to talk alongside a more general withdrawal from peers. One group experienced not only withdrawal, but also gastrointestinal distress and refusal to eat when angry.

Girls spoke about feeling a disproportionate amount of pressure to perform well academically in comparison to their brothers. They also mentioned feeling more pressure to behave well at school, and stricter consequences for their misbehavior as compared with brothers. Alongside these differential expectations perceived, one fifth grade group discussed girls' angry appearance compared to that of boys. While they felt that both boys and girls were "ugly" when angry, girls were seen as even less attractive, due to the demands they felt to be "pretty."

Within interviews, some noteworthy issues arose with regard to female identity. First, one group of fifth grade girls portrayed their sex as being more vulnerable to

adversity inflicted by boys, namely unwanted pregnancy and violence. They determined mothers to be more fearful for girls' well-being because of these vincibilities. In another interview, one eighth grader played the role of a boy throughout the session, choosing a typically male name and making verbal statements denying her own identity as a girl. Although her motives for choosing the male identity were not directly addressed in the interview, it may be speculated, based on certain of her comments, that she felt some distaste for the idea of being female.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study was begun with the expectation that data obtained from anger expression and depression measures would support previously established findings with regard to female anger suppression and depression. Additionally, quantitative material gathered was expected to shed light on gender socialization processes by revealing significant age or grade differences as well as sex differences in anger suppression and depression. Specifically, it was expected that girls' anger suppression and depression indices, while being significantly correlated, would both exceed corresponding scores received by boys. Age was also expected to distinguish girls with regard to both anger suppression and depression, with girls in seventh through ninth grades receiving both higher scores on the two indices and showing stronger correlations between the two than their counterparts in grades four through six.

These results were expected to directly support Rutter's (1986) assumption that rates of depression for males and females diverge dramatically somewhere between childhood and adulthood. Further, such results would have directly evidenced the notion that anger suppression, more common among girls, is a critical component in a form of gender socialization that contributes to depressive symptomatology. Since substantial research also couples anger suppression with depression (Thomas, 1989; Thomas &

Atakan, 1993), it was assumed that such internalization of oppositional feelings is both a factor in the development of gendered identity and cultivates eventual higher rates of depression for girls. Especially when viewed in light of evidence that girls manifest more internalization of emotional distress than do boys (Harris et al., 1991), the concept of suppressed anger was thought to be directly related to depression in girls, giving rise to increases in symptomatology as girls develop.

Certain of this study's hypotheses were in fact supported. Girls of all grade levels sampled were shown to suppress and control anger at higher rates than boys, who conversely externalized their anger significantly more than girls. Reflecting the idea that girls sacrifice or "disavow" aspects of themselves during adolescence (Gilligan, 1991), these young females seemed to internalize their anger instead of communicating it more apparently. Stated differently, girls sampled in this study tended not to demonstrate their angry feelings actively nor direct some behavior toward the source of their frustration. They tended instead to endorse statements such as "I control my temper," "I keep my cool," "I hold my anger in," "I hide my anger," "I get mad inside but I don't show it," "I can stop myself from losing my temper," and "I'm afraid to show my anger."

While girls did suppress more anger than boys, this internalization did not render them more prone to depression than their male counterparts. Depressive symptoms, as measured with the CDI, were no more prevalent for girls than for boys, and no more prevalent for older girls than for younger girls. Further, no substantial linkage between suppressed anger and depression was indicated by this study's results. Failure to support

hypotheses regarding the link between girls' suppressed anger and depression raises questions about how internalization of distress becomes manifest in girls, prior to adulthood. Given that depression was no more likely in girls, and that it was not tied to suppression of anger, it follows that girls' anger suppression produces some other effect at these developmental levels. Whatever effect anger suppression generates for females in grades four through nine, if any, was not detected by the Children's Depression Inventory.

Although using depression to trace girls' gender socialization was not validated by this study's quantitative measures, the issue of anger suppression as a component in gender identity development was supported. In addition to the credibility given this notion by girls' responses on the PAES III, tremendous information was generated via structured, qualitative interviewing. Herein, not only was anger stylistic described with regard to gendered behavior, descriptions of certain types of symptomatology emerged during girls' discussions about anger. The following six major areas of information were generated through the interviewing: (1) girls' associations of anger with negativity; (2) girls' perceptions of boys' anger expressions; (3) girls' descriptions of their own anger expressions; (4) patterns of interaction between parents with regard to anger; (5) girls' reported symptoms relative to their suppression of anger; and (6) issues pertinent to class and ethnicity in girls' expression of anger.

First, paralleling Thomas' (1990) assertion of anger's historically pejorative connotations, girls associated anger almost exclusively with negative things. While there is no direct comparison here to boys' associations with anger, girls' productions of such

aversive notions about the feeling correspond directly with quantitative information obtained. If girls experience anger as a solely unfortunate state of affairs, it stands to reason that they would wish to avoid the emotion and perhaps suppress or internalize it.

Second, girls' perceptions of how boys act out their anger and how other people respond was another major area of information gathered. Girls' association of boys' anger with violence, a dramatic example of anger-out, and their expressed fear of angry boys, stood in sharp contrast with their overall descriptions of angry girls' internalizing behaviors. The perceived dichotomy runs parallel with recent findings of male anger expression as more likely violent and female anger expression as more likely to involve body language and reciprocal communication (Morris, Deffenbacher, Lynch, & Oetting, 1996). Further, reports of anger-out most often involved some kind of aggression, either verbal or physical.

While highlighting the perceived distinction between boys' and girls' anger expression stylistics, the scenario also raises a question about girls' reactivity to their own negative perceptions of boys' anger. Most often, accompanying their descriptions of boys' externalization were accounts of their own distance from those boys. Further, younger girls tended to insult these aggressive boys calling them "wimpy," "stupid," or "typical." Paradoxically, girls expressed the notion that boys' anger-out behaviors were expected and, perhaps, accepted by parents and teachers to a degree. While fathers coached their sons to aggress, teachers looked the other way to avoid violent episodes with angry boys. This trend corresponded with earlier studies showing boys' anger expressions and girls'

fear expressions to be reinforced by parents (Birnbaum & Croll, 1984; Kendrick & Dunn, 1983).

Third, information was generated about girls' anger expressions and the reactions given by significant people. Girls' anger was most often depicted as being downplayed in some way either through diminishment as something trivial or through distance by boys, fathers and often teachers. Perhaps girls' overall suppression of anger, as revealed through their PAES III responses, involves more than simple aversion to the emotion. Learning to expect some kind of insult, however subtle, to one's feelings or opinions, internalization becomes an alternative to a more openly truncating experience. Since girls sometimes unexpectedly characterized boys as afraid of girls' anger, a containment of feeling could be produced to protect relationships with those boys.

When girls showed more unexpectedly aggressive behaviors, they were ostracized by the other females in their peer group. Given that girls also controlled their anger (made efforts to avoid a temper outburst) significantly more than boys in this sample, anger-out demonstrated by girls would appear out of the ordinary. These interviewees condemned the anger-out behaviors noted in other girls and seemed to connect it with gender-atypicality. As if they had come to internalize the diminishment of others with regard to girls' anger, these young females judged harshly their peers' use of conduct deemed "like a boy." Revisiting Gilligan's (1991) ideas around girls' "impasse" in development, it would

appear that these girls have not only learned to compromise their own self-information but may expect other girls to do the same, creating a norm for gendered behavior.

Fourth, interactional information was generated regarding parents' responses to girls' anger. Although mothers were characterized as supportive of girls' anger to a point, girls seemed to intuit the limits on their freedom to express these feelings to their mothers. Girls perceived their anger as offensive, especially if it was not easily soothed by their mothers' nurturance. These girls depicted their mothers as eventually punishing, seemingly exasperated at their daughters' anger or at their inability to extinguish it. Fivush (1991), studying mother-child conversations about past events, found mothers spending less time discussing angry events with girls than with boys. Perhaps these prior findings, along with Fivush's observation that mothers accepted anger from boys more readily than from girls, are consistent with girls' interview statements about their mothers' lack of tolerance for their anger. Given this study's assumptions about female socialization away from anger, mothers' aversion to their daughters' oppositional expressions compares with their own possible training to suppress.

To complicate the picture of mother-daughter anger expression, in an almost twofold diminishment, fathers were said to undercut mothers' attempts to deal punitively with their daughters' anger. While this intervention was appreciated by girls in trouble with their mothers for angry behavior, the "pity" bestowed by fathers may have had an unforeseen impact. By creating an apparent collusion between parent and child, dads

may have also disabled both females in the scenario, diminishing both the anger of the girl and her mother.

Therefore, not only were girls illustrating their own diminishment as compared to boys when experiencing oppositional feelings, they saw their mothers' angry behaviors subtly undercut by their fathers, contributing to an overall picture of female anger that discourages open, direct expression. This observation leads to another issue derived from the qualitative analysis of girls' interviews. Although direct anger expression seemed to be either forbidden or degraded for these girls in most social contexts, more indirect forms of expression received tacit endorsement by the girls themselves. Behaviors such as withdrawal, refusal to talk, and refusal to eat emerged as common among girls who were angry, consistent with studies showing girls to internalize rather than externalizing their distress (Earls, 1987; Gjinde, Block & Block, 1988; Seiden, 1989). While failing to allow for proactive engagement with the environment or source of frustration, these more passive expressions of anger provided alternatives to being ridiculed by peers.

Fifth, information obtained during interviews involved girls' reported symptomatology and (or) symptomatic behavior patterns when feeling angry. Although responses for girls on the CDI failed to significantly correlate with those on the PAES III, girls described their own behaviors and attitudes which in many cases are components of clinical syndromes. The withdrawal noted among girls to occur when a friend is angry is a behavior often described in conjunction with depression. Though these episodic retreats from social connections may not amount to "markedly diminished interest or pleasure"

(American Psychiatric Association, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 1994, fourth edition) in friendships, and so forth, they do appear similar to behaviors typically associated with depression. Girls' refusal to eat, though not itself a criterion for a clinical syndrome, appears reminiscent of disordered eating, also associated with depressive illness. These behavioral trends corresponded with symptomatology noted by Jack (1987) and Steiner-Adair (1986) related to adolescent females' disavowal of self. Petersen's (1988) assertion regarding adolescence as a time of psychological danger for girls may have to do with emerging behavioral markers of depression and corresponding removal of self from relationships (Stern, 1991).

Such behaviors appear analogous to the higher levels of anger suppression found for girls in this study and may parallel Brody's (1985) regulatory mechanisms, Mayer et al.'s (1991) mood management-related processes, and Lazarus' (1991) concept of coping. In other words, internalization of intense or oppositional feelings may actually help girls regulate their emotions, thereby protecting social relationships. Similarly, this affect-regulation appears reflective of Gilligan's (1991) ideas that girls limit their knowledge of incoming information to achieve goals of self-in-relation. The symptomatic behaviors certainly appear consistent with earlier findings of adolescent females' more likely internalized versus externalized expressions of distress (Earls, 1987; Seiden, 1989) and actual "internalizing disorders" have been associated with anxious withdrawal behavior and a depressive attributional style (Dahlmeier & Borduin, 1996). For postcognitive emotion theorists (Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1984; Sherer, 1984), using suppression or

other regulatory behaviors results from some belief or system of beliefs about the consequences (social or otherwise) of experiencing the full weight of the feeling involved.

Finally, the issues of ethnicity and class held information which emerged during the qualitative interviews. The African American interviewee's observations of more direct expression among black females agrees with Debold et al. (1993) and others (Brown & Gilligan, 1992) that pressure to conform to passive construals of femininity is not equally shared across ethnic or class distinctions. White girls queried in these interviews saw no anger expression differences between they and either African American or Hispanic girls and may be expressing a form of ethnocentricity shared by many in dominant cultures. Since the only interviewee who mentioned differences across groups was African American, a question is raised about whether girls of color are in a position to more readily notice cultural differences in emotional expression. Given the power differential embedded in our multiethnic society, girls of minority status may have more survival-related need to notice the discrepant ways anger is handled between groups.

Implications for Theory

This study's findings generate implications for existing theory, both in direct support of and in raising questions about the various models reviewed. First, in terms of development, girls' higher levels of anger suppression lend support to traditional theories of development when viewed from a strictly linear perspective. Taking an Eriksonian approach, girls' endorsement of statements like "I hold my anger in" could be seen as passivity, or leaving oneself only partially defined for the sake of some social goal or ideal.

Viewed from within the current thinking on emotional development as outlined by Brody (1985), however, girls' restriction of affect represents a move toward increasing self-regulation and more sophisticated level of functioning. In this way, the suppression of anger may reflect a stronger intuitive sense about the ramifications of direct, overt expression. Izard's (1991) differential emotions theory seems to accommodate this notion, adding that girls are appropriately responding to socialization pressures when they learn to curb their anger expressions. This interpretation is also consistent with Kopper and Epperson's (1991) writing that women are socially reinforced for hiding, suppressing, or indirectly expressing anger.

Using the more widely held assumptions about emotional development, one would expect to find increasing age bringing increasing levels of affect regulation. However, contrary to widely held opinions regarding emotional development (Brody, 1985), age did not bring these girls (or boys) any more suppression of anger. The lack of progression predicted by theory could reflect actual similarities in affect management across developmental levels, or could be an artifact of the age ranges used for this study.

Further, unlike predictions from psychoanalytic, object relations, and sociological theories, girls in this sample were no more depressed than boys, raising questions about the overall picture of vulnerability painted of females by these theoretical models. Though girls' sensitivity to social cues encouraging anger suppression was not matched with true depression according to the CDI, it may have been accompanied by self-directed hostility as predicted by those theories, detectable only in the qualitative interview setting.

Evidence from the investigative sessions supports this notion as reflected in girls' descriptions of themselves as "ugly" when angry, their tendency to deprive themselves of food, and their apparent loathing of other girls who displayed their anger in more overt ways.

Certain comments may be made about the link between previously noted prevalence of women's depression versus men's (Frankel, 1992; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990) and the lack of such prevalence in childhood (Allgood-Merten et al., 1990). The mixed findings of this study may reflect Gilligan's (1991) notions about how girls become pressured to assume the images of "perfection" in adolescence. While allowing for agreeableness (i.e., anger suppression), such phantasmic idealism leaves little room for any corresponding impact. Perhaps the higher levels of depression found in women pertain to an eventual impact of longer-term anger suppression, while girls experience a suspension of self in which clinical depression is difficult to detect. As mentioned previously, girls in this investigation comprised a limited range of ages, and the lack of disparity between their depression scores and those of boys may simply reflect grade-levels chosen for study. Perhaps detectable differences between males and females in depressive illness occur at some point later in the teen years or early twenties. On the other hand, girls may at these younger developmental levels be demonstrating depressive behaviors which have not yet translated into full blown clinical syndromes. Given continued development, girls' "withdrawal," "refusal to eat," and

"refusal to talk" may result in overall patterns of behavior that culminate in a tendency toward depression.

Although Brown and Gilligan's (1992) writings about the "perfect" female image closely correspond with some girls in this sample around avoidance of oppositional expressions and in their often internalized manifestations of anger, they may not account for other girls' reported use of violence and verbal aggression. These unexpected reports run counter to predictions about gender socialization and girls' behavior. Refusal to eat or talk when angry easily reflects adoption of socially defined norms for female appearance or demeanor, also reflective of Horney's (1926) much earlier idea that females experience dysphoria when attempting to mirror patriarchal values in their behavior.

Paradoxically, viewing more recent theory (Brown & Gilligan, 1992) in light of Horney's assertion, girls who reported use of violence and (or) verbal aggression could be adopting a male-valued means for resolving conflict, and in so doing, attempting to attain another form of perfection by emulating what they perceive to be rewarded in boys. Perhaps some girls have learned to value aggression for its own perceived social benefit and find themselves correspondingly in the confusing position of being criticized. Further, refusal to eat may reflect adoption of patriarchally-defined body image or may be an effort to obtain some degree of psychological control over self and context.

Theories of female emotional development within the context of relationships also receive implications from this study's results. Support for Miller's (1976) "self-in-relation" as well as Gilligan's (1991) "impasse in development" theories become validated by these

girls' endorsement of behaviors other than overt expression of oppositional feelings. In other words, these girls demonstrate the phenomenon wherein anger is held inside to protect social relationships or standing while aspects of the self are removed by default from those relationships.

Lemaku and Landau's (1986) assertion that female anger suppression reflects a selfless attention to relationships may also be supported by these findings. The double-bind faced by adolescent girls could be played out in their restriction of "negative" affect by both suppression and control alongside qualitative accounts of their avoidance of people when angry. Herein, both the forces of connection and disconnection appear to affect girls' behavior in contradictory ways. The phenomenon labeled "silencing the self" (Jack, 1987, 1991) could be operant in girls' avoidance of anger within relationships, as such connections are thought to organize female experience.

In a larger context, the dilemma sets up a potential complementarity for male-female peer relationships wherein girls suppress or control while boys outwardly express anger. Stated differently, when girls reign in their anger expressions and fear those of boys, potential for reinforcing stereotyped patterns runs high. Such complementarity is consistent with research finding dichotomous anger expression styles to appear with increasing age of boys and girls (Shennum & Bugental, 1982). The dichotomy parallels findings by Brody, Hay and Vandewater (1990) that both sexes fear boys more than girls and also reflects Miller's (1983) notion that females suppress anger because they

incorporate both the threat of direct force from males and the insinuation that they have no valid reason to be angry.

Corresponding with Thompson and Hart's (1996) finding that women "silencing" themselves experience decreased intimacy and insecure attachment patterns, the gender-dichotomous dilemma creates a risk for girls to share only limited aspects of their feelings with each other, as well as with males. Although they may talk more with other girls than with boys, young females may learn to say less directly about their anger, even to their female friends, thus contributing to their isolation from other girls. To restate, the apparent suppression and control of anger reported by girls may establish norms unto itself, reinforcing complementarity between males and females as well as negative social judgments made about girls who express anger more directly. Such a pattern may influence later depression in women as years of isolation from other females results in an overall pattern for relationship behavior. Perhaps counter to Bernardez-Bonesatti's (1978) assertion that women avoid anger to protect their connections to men, it seems plausible that women protect connections with other women by "saving face" or hiding their anger. In paradoxical fashion, the removal of "angry self" from relationships makes probable a greater degree of disconnection from other females as well as males.

In terms of relationships with parents, since these figures were qualitatively characterized as distancing, punishing or pitying in response to girls' anger, messages may be herein conveyed that anger is dangerous and unacceptable. Practically speaking, girls may again learn to expect distance, minimization, punishment or "rescue" as responses to

their anger. This pattern has continued potential for influencing relationships (both same and other-sex) in general. Girls may come to expect males to distance, disengage or rescue them, thereby invalidating their own strength and feelings. They may come to expect judgment, criticism and punishment from other females, promoting only partial connection with same-sex peers.

In sum, the largest implications for theory generated by this study's results involve further elaboration and specificity. Elaboration is needed within models that imply functionality of anger suppression in females. Where girls are characterized as learning to avoid oppositional feelings for the sake of relationships (Gilligan, 1991), more can be said about the practical advantages of doing so. In light of social pressure to suppress anger, girls' experience of this phenomenon along with related attitudes and symptoms has adaptive significance.

Similarly, elaboration is deserved regarding girls' families' involvement in the socialization process. Systemic factors that operate in the culture at large to discourage female anger are likely modeled between a girl's parents creating powerful illustrations for her emulation. In terms of specificity, developmental models such as Izard's (1991) having to do with the socialization of affective expression could be enhanced with details regarding age progression and approximate time lines for symptom development.

Implications for Practice

Applying this study's results to the area of clinical practice, implications in the following pertinent areas emerged: (1) affect expression in the context of relationships; (2)

symptomatology related to emotion and its regulation; and (3) anger expression style. These three domains within the context of emotional development offer elaboration on existing understanding of the young girl. Since girls in this sample controlled or suppressed substantially more anger than boys, it is plausible that girls in psychotherapy would benefit from exploration of these three domains.

First, anger expression style, the primary focus of this study, comprises an area of concern for practicing clinicians. Having an understanding of girls' anger expression modalities within the context of their emotional development may help practitioners work with girls to maximize their emotional coping resources. Although depression did not correlate significantly with girls' tendency to suppress anger, reasons abound for helping girls develop alternative behaviors. If girls' reported internalization of affect predisposes them to later depression, as predicted by research and theory (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983; Beutler et al, 1986; Jones et al, 1992; Sperberg, 1992; Thomas, 1989; Thomas & Atakan, 1993), young females need to develop different means of coping with anger.

Girls stand to benefit in terms of self esteem and self efficacy given options for handling strong feelings. Since assertiveness is held to be negatively associated with anger suppression (Delamater & McNamara, 1987), it would seem likely to increase given more proactive means for communicating anger. Caution is in order regarding the facilitation of girls' anger expression, however. The clinician should be sensitive to potential social consequences for girls' behaving in ways alternative to the norm for gendered affect expression. Given responses by girls in this study to their female peers' atypical behavior,

it is likely that young clients need preparation for possible criticism by their cohorts. In addition, girls may need to explore the positive aspects of their more relational orientation and its tendency to lead to internalization of feelings. When valued as an aspect of femininity in a broader sense, anger suppression for the sake of relational ties becomes de-pathologized.

Girls additionally stand to benefit in terms of their physical health given alternatives to suppressing anger. Revisiting work done by Greer and Watson (1985) as well as others (Cottington et al., 1986; Kune et al., 1991; Mills & Dimsdale, 1993; Spicer et al., 1993), it appears that girls' greater likelihood of suppressing anger renders them more vulnerable to stress-related illness. Therefore, adding to their repertoire of anger expression modalities would seem physiologically beneficial as well.

Second, since much of clinical practice focuses on relationship issues in some form, it is helpful to understand how girls function in such contexts as well as how they become influenced by them. Girls' greater tendency to internalize oppositional feelings, alongside Gilligan's (1990) characterization of anger as a signal of something needing attention in the relational context provides a rationale for addressing the emotion between protagonists, especially within families.

This study's results suggest that girls take notice of how their intense feelings affect significant others and often alter their expression thereof. Accordingly, girls in therapy (and their families) may benefit from exploration of their roles in relation to others and of the ways their inclinations or instincts are changed by these roles. Given Stern's

(1991) as well as Gilligan's (1991) advances that girls limit their knowledge of incoming sensory information to protect social connections, this precarious balance deserves clarification within a family context. Such clarification could facilitate girls' reclaiming awareness of emotional states and their catalysts in the relational context, promoting proactive engagement with environmental stimuli to affect change.

Revisiting Izard (1991), unfortunate symptoms of anger suppression could involve relationships, and appropriate expression thereof may serve to strengthen connections between protagonists. Within girls' relationships, direct anger expression may be reconstrued as enhancing dynamic interaction versus jeopardizing closeness between people. In so doing, the clinician must work to increase such awareness within girls' families first, as these primary relationships form templates for other social connections. Family therapy, attending to various dyadic and triadic relationships as the classroom for learning anger expression skills may help girls develop a less adversarial relationship with their own intense feelings.

Moreover, girls would benefit from seeing their parents handle anger between each other in direct, respectful ways. Given the aforementioned dynamic wherein some mothers' anger was characterized as being downplayed, the practitioner should note the ways that intense feelings are handled between parents. Girls in these scenarios could learn more assertive anger expression methods by modeling those of their mothers and begin to unlearn the expectation for diminishment as they observe their fathers respecting these feelings.

In concert with family therapy to address anger expression styles, girls could benefit from group therapy with same-aged females. This kind of setting would provide a safe context for the relearning of instinctual emotional response and the direct, assertive expression of even the most oppositional feelings. Further, girls could begin reintroducing themselves into relationships with other girls as they practice understanding and respecting each others' anger, without having to submerge aspects of themselves in order to participate in those relationships.

Finally, it is assumed that most, if not all, presenting concerns of girls and their families in therapy involve symptomatology of some kind. Therefore, it is helpful for clinicians to understand various reported behaviors and assumed correlates of anger suppression. Girls presenting to psychotherapy with eating problems, isolative behavior, or distorted physical images of themselves may be suppressing anger and experiencing concerns similar to girls in this study. Although girls may not show clinically significant levels of depressogenic behavior or attitudes, the patterns of avoidance or internalization deserve attention in treatment. Girls acting out their anger may also be suffering the negative social consequences of such gender atypical behavior and need to explore the ramifications of their externalization.

Implications for Research

The following are areas in which future studies on girls' emotional development and anger expression could improve and build upon the current findings. Given the results of this study and its particular emphases, suggestions for further research involve the

major areas of design, instrumentation, and types of data sought.

In terms of design, replication of this study with a larger sample would enhance the credibility of these findings. Specifically, larger samples drawn from a variety of geographical areas would address the possibility that obtained results in this investigation reflected specific cultures in a southern, urban school district. This improvement would also facilitate the addressing of class and ethnicity issues embedded in gender socialization and affect expression. Further, using age groups separated by wider disparities could highlight the developmental process suggested by others (Shennum & Bugental, 1982) yet not validated in this study. Qualitative interviewing of individuals from these more varied groups could yield tremendous expansion on our current understanding of the interaction between socialized emotionality and gendered behavior.

Regarding instrumentation, using more sensitive indices of depression could perhaps uncover any gender differences at these young ages which were not detected by the CDI. Perhaps future studies employing multiple measures of depressive symptomatology could shed additional light on the effects of girls' greater tendency to internalize anger at these ages. Family assessment instrumentation is also needed to determine the influence of anger management within girls' families on their emotional development and gender socialization.

In addition to gathering family-related data in future studies, more demographic information would enhance our understanding of ethnicity, class, and other important family variables in determining a girl's socialization. For example, income levels of all

participants' families along with parents' educational levels and religious affiliations would contribute to the overall picture of emotional and gender socialization painted by this study's results. Each type of information gathered could be significantly elaborated upon given further qualitative inquiry of girls, boys, and their families.

Conclusions

This study's results showed girls to suppress significantly more anger than boys and to describe being perceived in negative ways when angry. Girls also disparaged the externalizing behaviors of angry boys and of other girls who used aggression as a means for resolving conflict. Although direct measures of depression failed to yield expected divergence between girls and boys at these grade levels, young females in this study gave indications that they understood gender-prescriptive expectations for their refrain from outward anger expression. Further, this understanding promoted more internal means of coping with anger which seemed consistent with depressive symptomatology. For girls in grades four through nine, this study pointed to a position in their emotional development wherein they internalized gendered expectations for anger expression and began using gendered, adaptive means for coping with the feeling.

In broadest terms, the results of this study may point to both the degree to which girls learn to internalize anger as well as to qualitative results suggestive of depression precursors potentially related to anger suppression. The family's role as well as that of the larger social environment are also implicated in this socialization process. As in many circumstances, while theory addresses many aspects of study results, apertures still exist,

indicating that additional research must be done in order to keep pace with theory. Results of this study highlight the importance of closer examination of developmental models with regard to depression precursors in girls, as well as their involvement in gender socialization. These circumstances suggest a need for further testing of feminist reformulations of developmental theory as well as that investigating models not specific to females. Results of this study and their implications also suggest a need for increased levels of recursive reciprocity between feminist theory and research in emotional development, affect expression, and gender socialization.

References

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1983). Taxonomic issues in child psychopathology. In T. H. Ollendick, & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of child psychopathology (pp. 65-93). New York: Plenum.

Allgood-Merten, B., Lewinsohn, P.M., & Hops, H. (1990). Sex differences and adolescent depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99 (1), 55-63.

American Association of University Women. (1991). Shortchanging girls, shortchanging America. Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C. M., & Holder, D. P. (1989). Women and serious mental disorders. In M. McGoldrick, C. Anderson, & F. Walsh (Eds.), Women in families: A framework for family therapy (pp. 381-397). New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc.

Angold, A. (1988). Childhood and adolescent depression: I. Epidemiological and etiological aspects. British Journal of Psychiatry, 152, 601-617.

Averill, J. R. (1982). Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Averill, J. R. (1983). Studies on anger and aggression: Implications for theories of emotion. American Psychologist, 38, 1145-1160.

Basch, M. F. (1976). The concept of affect: A re-examination. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 26, 759-777.

Beck, A. T. (1967). Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects. New York: Hoeber.

Beck, A. T. (1976). Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders. New York: International Universities Press.

Beitchman, J. H., Kruidenier, B., Inglis, A., & Clegg, M. (1989). The children's self-report questionnaire: Factor score age trends and gender differences. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 28 (5), 714-722.

Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formation and regulation of anger and aggression: A cognitive-neoassociationistic analysis. American Psychologist, 45 (3), 494-503.

Bernardez-Bonesatti, T. (1978). Women and anger: Conflicts with aggression in contemporary women. Journal of the American Medical Women's Association, 33, 215-219.

Bernardez, T. (1987). Women and anger: Cultural prohibitions and the feminine ideal. Work in Progress, No. 31. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Beutler, L. E., Engle, D., Oro'-Beutler, M.E., Daldrup, R., & Meredith, K. (1986). Inability to express intense affect: A common link between depression and pain? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54 (6), 752-759.

Biaggio, M. K., & Godwin, W. H. (1987). Relation of depression to anger and hostility constructs. Psychological Reports, 61(3), 87-90.

Birnbaum, D. W., & Croll, W. L. (1984). The etiology of children's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. Sex Roles, 10, 677-691.

Blanck, P. D., Rosenthal, R., Snodgrass, S., DePaulo, B., & Zuckerman, M. (1981). Sex differences in eavesdropping on nonverbal cues: Developmental changes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41(2), 391-396.

Block, J. (1973). Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 28 (6), 512-526.

Brenner, C. (1980). A psychoanalytic theory of affects. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), Emotion: theory, research and experience. (Vol. 1, pp. 341-347). New York: Academic Press.

Brody, L. R. (1985). Gender differences in emotional development: A review of theories and research. Journal of Personality, 53 (2), 102-149.

Brody, L. R., Hay, D. H., & Vandewater, E. (1990). Gender, gender role identity, and children's reported feelings toward the same and opposite sex. Sex Roles, 23 (7-8), 363-387.

Brown, L. (1989). Narratives of Relationship: The development of a care orientation in girls 7 to 16. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Brown, L.M. (1991). Telling a girl's life: Self-authorization as a form of resistance. Women and Therapy, 11 (3-4), 71-86.

Brown, L. M. (1994). Educating the resistance: Encouraging girls' strong feelings and critical voices. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the Association of Moral Education.

Brown, L. M. (1995). Adolescent girls, class, and the cultures of femininity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1993). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development, Feminism and Psychology, 3 (1), 11-35.

Buck, R. (1982). Spontaneous and symbolic nonverbal behavior and the ontogeny of communication. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), Development of nonverbal behavior in children (pp. 29-62). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Buck, R. (1988). Human motivation and emotion (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Butler, J. (1991). Imitation and gender insubordination. In D. Fuss, Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories. New York: Routledge.

Carey, T. C., Finch, A. J., & Carey, M. P. (1991). Relation between differential emotions and depression in emotionally disturbed children and adolescents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59 (4), 594-597.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collier, H. V. (1982). Counseling women: A guide for therapists. New York: Free Press.

Cottington, E. M., Matthews, K. A., Talbott, E., & Kuller, L. H. (1986). Occupational stress, suppressed anger, and hypertension. Psychosomatic Medicine, 48 (3-4), 249-260.

Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Onyx, J., Gault, U., & Benton, P. (1992). Emotion and Gender, London: Sage.

Crowley, S. L., Thompson, B., & Worchel, F. (1994). The Children's Depression Inventory: A comparison of generalizability and classical test theory analyses. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54 (3), 705-713.

Culkin, J., & Perotto, R. S. (1985a). Assertiveness factors and depression in a sample of college women. Psychological Reports, 57 (3), 1015-1020.

Culkin, J., & Perotto, R. S. (1985b). Assertiveness and depression: An examination of direct and moderated relationships. Unpublished manuscript, In J. Culkin & R. S. Perotto (1985).

Cunningham, J., & Shapiro, L. (1984). Infant affective expression as a function of infant and adult gender. Unpublished manuscript, Brandeis University, Waltham. In Brody (1985).

Dahlmeier, J. M., & Borduin, C. M. (1996, August). The ecology of internalizing and externalizing disorders in adolescents. Paper presented at the 104th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Debold, E., Wilson, M., & Malave, I. (1993). Mother-daughter revolution. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Delamater, R. J., & McNamara, J. R. (1987). Expression of anger: Its relationship to assertion and social desirability among college women. Psychological Reports, 61, 131-134.

Deutsch, H. (1944). Psychology of women, (Vol. 1). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Earls, F. (1987). Sex Differences in psychiatric disorders: Origins and developmental influences. Psychiatric Developments, 1, 1-23.

Ebata, A. (1987). A longitudinal study of psychological distress during early adolescence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University. In L. Stern (1991). Disavowing the self in female adolescence, Women and Therapy, 11, 105-117.

Ekman, P., & Oster, H. (1979). Facial expressions of emotion. Annual Review of Psychology, 30, 527-554.

Ellis, A. (1962). Reason and emotion in psychotherapy. New York: Lyle Stuart.

Engle, D., Beutler, L. E., & Daldrup, R. J. (1991). Focused expressive psychotherapy: Treating blocked emotions. In J. Safran & L. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Emotion, psychotherapy & change (pp. 169-196). New York: The Guilford Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Feinman, J. A., & Feldman, R. S. (1982). Decoding children's expressions of affect. Child Development, 53, 710-716.

Fivush, R. (1991). Gender and emotion in mother-child conversations about the past. Journal of Narrative and Life History, 1 (4), 325-341.

Frank, E. F., Carpenter, L. L., Kupfer, D. J. (1988). Sex differences in recurrent depression: Are there any that are significant? American Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 41-45.

Frankel, L. P. (1992). Women, anger and depression: Strategies for self-empowerment. Deerfield Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Inc.

Freud, S. (1946). Instincts and their vicissitudes. In Collected papers (Vol. IV, pp. 60-83), Longon: Hogarth Press. (Original work published in 1921).

Freud, S. (1961). Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. In J. Strachey (Ed. And trans.), Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, (Vol. 19, pp. 248-258). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1925).

Freud, S. (1965). Femininity. In James Strachy, (Ed. and trans.), New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis (pp. 112-135). New York: W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1933).

Frijda, N. H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57 (2), 212-228.

Frodi, A., Macaulay, J., & Thome, P. R. (1977). Are women always less aggressive than men? A review of the experimental literature. Psychological Bulletin, 84 (4), 634-660.

Garrison, C., Shoenbach, V., & Kaplan, B. (1985). Depression symptoms in early adolescence. In A. Dead (Ed.), Depression in multidisciplinary perspective (pp. 60-82). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1984). New perspectives on female adolescent development. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University.

Gilligan, C. (1990). Joining the resistance: Psychology, politics, girls and women. Michigan Quarterly Review, 29 (4),501-536.

Gilligan, C. (1991). Women's psychological development: Implications for psychotherapy. Women and Therapy, 11 (3-4), 5-31.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. P., & Hammer, T. (1990). Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gjinde, P., Block, J., & Block, J. (1988). Depressive symptoms and personality during late adolescence: Gender differences in the externalization-internalization of symptom expression, Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97 (4), 475-486.

Goldman, L., & Haaga, D. A. F. (1995). Depression and the experience and expression of anger in marital and other relationships. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 183 (8), 505-509.

Goodenough, F. (1931). Anger in young children. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gotlib, I. H. (1984). Depression and general psychopathology in university students. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93 (1), 19-30.

Gray, J. A. (1982). Precis of the neuropsychology of anxiety. The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 5, 464-534.

Greenberg, J. R., & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). Object relations in psychoanalytic theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenberg, L. S., & Safran, J. D. (1989). Emotion in psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 44 (1), 19-29.

Greer, S., & Watson, M. (1985). Towards a psychobiological model of cancer: Psychological considerations. Special Issue: Cancer and the mind. Social Science and Medicine, 20 (8), 773-777.

Grove, W., & Herb, T. (1974). Stress and mental illness among the young. Social Forces, 53, 256-265.

Hagglund, K. J., Clay, D. L., Frank, R. G., Beck, N.C., Kashani, J.H., Hewett, J., Johnson, J., Goldstein, D. E., & Cassidy, J. T. (1994). Assessing anger expression in children and adolescents. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 19 (3), 291-304.

Harburg, E., Blakelock, E. H., & Roeper, P. J. (1979). Resentful and reflective coping with arbitrary authority and blood pressure: Detroit. Psychosomatic Medicine, 3, 189-202.

Harris, L., Blum, R.W., & Resnick, M. (1991). Teen females in Minnesota: A portrait of quiet disturbance. Women and Therapy, 11, (3-4), 119-135.

Haviland, J. J., & Malatesta, C. Z. (1981). The development of sex differences in nonverbal signals: Fallacies, facts, and fantasies. In C. Mayo & N. Healy (Eds.), Gender and nonverbal behavior (pp. 183-208). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Sex differences in moral internalization and values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32 (4), 720-729.

Horney, K. (1926). The flight from womanhood. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 7, 324-339.

Hunter, S. M., Wolf, T. M., Sklov, M. C., Webber, L. S., Watson, R. M., & Berenson, G. S. (1982). Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern and cardiovascular risk variables in children and adolescents: The Bogalusa heart study. Journal of Chronic Diseases, 35, 613-621.

Izard, C. E. (1978). Emotions as motivations: An evolutionary-developmental perspective. In H. E. Howe, Jr. (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation, (Vol. 26). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Izard, C. E. (1991). Perspectives on emotions in psychotherapy. In J. D. Safran & L. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Emotion, psychotherapy & change (pp. 280-289). New York: The Guilford Press.

Izard, C. E., Dougherty, B.M., Blowxom, B. M., & Kotsch, W. E. (1974). The differential emotions scale: A method of measuring the subjective experience of discrete emotions. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Jack, D. C. (1987). Silencing the Self: The power of social imperatives in female depression. In R. Formanek & A. Gurian (Eds.), Women and depression: A lifespan perspective (pp. 161-181). New York: Springer.

Jack, D. C. (1991). Silencing the self: Women and depression. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jacobs, G. A., & Blumer, C. H. (1985). Development of a pediatric anger expression scale. Paper presented at the meeting of Social and Behavioral Medicine, New Orleans, LA. In J. H. Kashani, L. A. Canfield, S. M. Soltys, & J. C. Reid (1995). Psychiatric inpatient children's family perceptions and anger expression. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 3 (1), 13-18.

Jacobs, G. A. (1989). Brief measures of pediatric anger and anxiety. In G. A. Jacobs, M. Phelps, & B. Rohrs, (1989). Assessment of anger expression in children: The Pediatric Anger Expression Scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 10 (1), 59-65.

Jacobs, G. A., Phelps, M., & Rohrs, B. (1989). Assessment of anger expression in children: The Pediatric Anger Expression Scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 10 (1), 59-65.

Jacobs, G. A., & Kronaizl, C. (1991). Pediatric anger in rural impoverished communities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. In K. J. Hagglund, et al (1994).

James, W. (1890). The Principles of Psychology. New York: Holt.

Jones, M. B., & Peacock, M. K. (1992). Self reported anger in adolescents. Health Values The Journal of Health Behavior, Education, and Promotion, 16 (2), 11-19.

Jones, M.B., Peacock, M.K., & Christopher, J. (1992). Self-reported anger in black high school adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Health, 13, 461-465.

Jung, C. G. (1940). The Integration of the Personality, London: Routledge.

Kagan, J. (1978). Sex differences in the human infant. In T. E. McGill, D. A. Dewsbury, & B. D. Sachs (Eds.), Sex and behavior: Status and prospectus (pp. 305-316). New York: Plenum Press.

Kandel, D., & Davies, M. (1982). Epidemiology of depressive mood in adolescents. Archives of General Psychiatry, 39, 1205-1212.

Kashani, J. H., Canfield, L. A., Soltys, S. M., & Reid, J. C. (1995). Psychiatric inpatient children's family perceptions and anger expression. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 3 (1), 13-18, 39.

Kaslow, N. J., Rehm, L. P., & Siegel, A. W. (1984). Social-cognitive and cognitive correlates of depression in children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 12, 605-620.

Kemp, S., & Strongman, K. T. (1995). Anger theory and management: A historical analysis. American Journal of Psychology, 108 (3), 397-417.

Kemper, T. D. (1978). Toward a sociology of emotions: Some problems and some solutions. The American Sociologist, 13 (1), 30-41.

Kendrick, C., & Dunn, J. (1983). Sibling quarrels and maternal responses. Developmental Psychology, 19 (1), 62-70.

King, L.A., & Emmons, R.A. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological and physical correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (5), 864-877.

Kloosterman, P. (1990). Attributions, performance following failure, and motivation in mathematics. In E. Fennema & G. C. Leder (Eds.), Mathematics and gender. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kazdin, A. E. (1981). Assessment techniques for childhood depression. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 20, 358-375.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohut, H. (1971). The analysis of the self. New York: International Universities Press.

Kopper, B. (1993). Role of gender, sex role identity, and type A behavior in anger expression and mental health functioning. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40 (3), 232-237.

Kopper, B. A., & Epperson, D. L. (1991). Women and anger: Sex and sex-role comparisons in the expression of anger. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 7-14.

Kovacs, M. (1981). Rating scales to assess depression in school aged children. Acta Paedopsychiatrica, 46, 305-315. In S. L. Crowley, B. Thompson, & F. Worchel (1994). The Children's Depression Inventory: A comparison of generalizability and classical test theory analyses. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54 (3), 705-713.

Kovacs, M. (1983). The Children's Depression Inventory: A self-rated depression scale for children. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. In B. A. Romano & R. O. Nelson (1988). Discriminant and concurrent validity of measures of children's depression. Journal of Child Clinical Psychology, 17 (3), 255-259.

Kovacs, M. (1986). The Children's Depression Inventory. In D. J. Keyser, & R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), Test Critiques (Vol. 5, pp. 65-72). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Kune, G. A., Kune, S., Watson, L. F., & Bahnson, C. B. (1991). Personality as a risk factor in large bowel cancer: Data from the melbourne colorectal cancer study. Psychological Medicine, 21 (1), 29-41.

Lang, P. J. (1983). Cognition in emotion: Concept and action. In C. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. Zajonc (Eds.), Emotion, cognition and behavior, (pp. 192-226). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Thoughts on the relations between emotions and cognition. American Psychologist, 37 (9), 1019-1024.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. American Psychologist, 46 (8), 819-834.

Lazarus, R. S., Averill, J. R., & Opton, E. M., Jr. (1970). Toward a cognitive theory of emotions. In M. Arnold (Ed.), Feelings and Emotions (pp. 207-232). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lea, G., & Paquin, M. (1981). Assertiveness and clinical depression. The Behavior Therapist, 4 (2), 9-10.

Lefevre, E. R., & West, M. L. (1981). Assertiveness: Correlations with self-esteem, locus of control, interpersonal anxiety, fear of disapproval, and depression. Psychiatric Journal of the University of Ottowa, 6, 247-251.

Lemakau, J. P., & Landau, C. (1986). The "selfless syndrome": Assessment and treatment considerations. Psychotherapy, 23, 227-233.

Lerner, H. (1985). The dance of anger. New York: Harper & Row.

Levenson, R.W. (1988). Emotion and the autonomic nervous system: A prospectus for research on autonomic specificity. In H. Wagner (Ed.), Social psychophysiology and emotion: Theory and clinical applications (pp. 17-42). London: Wiley.

Leventhal, H. (1982). The integration of emotion and cognition: A view from the perceptual-motor theory of emotion. In M. S. Clarke & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Affect and cognition: The 17th annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition (pp.121-156). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lewis, H. B. (1983). Freud and modern psychology. New York: Plenum Press.

Lewis, H. B. (1985). Depression vs. paranoia: Why are there sex differences in mental illness? Journal of Personality, 53 (2), 150-178.

Lewinsohn, P., Duncan, N., Stanton, A., & Hautzinger, M. (1986). Age at first onset for nonbipolar depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95 (4), 378-383.

Malatesta, C. Z., & Haviland, J. M. (1982). Learning display rules: The socialization of emotion expression in infancy. Child Development, 53, 991-1003.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98 (2), 224-253.

Matthews, K. A., & Angulo, J. (1980). Measurement of type A behavior pattern in children: assessment of children's competitiveness, impatience-anger, and aggression. Child Development, 51, 466-475.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Matheson, J. (1992). Working with adolescent girls in a residential treatment centre. Journal of Child and Youth Care, 7 (2), 31-39.

Mayer, J.D., & Gaschke, Y.N. (1988). The experience and meta-experience of mood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55 (1), 102-111.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Gomberg-Kaufman, S., & Blainey, K. (1991). A broader conception of mood experience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60 (1), 100-111.

McGrath, E., Keita, G.P., Strickland, B.R., & Russo, N.F. (Eds.). (1990). Women and depression: Risk factors and treatment issues: Final report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on Women and Depression. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Microsoft Corp. (1994). Works & Encarta.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (1983). The construction of anger in women and men: Work in progress. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies of Wellesley College.

Miller, J. B., & Surrey, J. (1990). Revisioning women's anger: The personal and the global. Work in Progress, No. 43. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Mills, P. J., & Dimsdale, J. E. (1993). Anger Suppression: Its relationship to b-adrenergic receptor sensitivity and stress-induced changes in blood pressure. Psychological Medicine, 23 (3), 673-678.

Mitchell, J. (1974). Psychoanalysis and feminism. New York: Pantheon Books.

Morris, C. D., Deffenbacher, J. L., Lynch, R. S., & Oetting, E. R. (1996, August). Anger expression and its consequences. Paper presented at the 104th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Multi Health Systems, Inc. (1992). The Children's Depression Inventory. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1987). Sex differences in unipolar depression: Evidence and theory. Psychological Bulletin, 101 (2), 259-282.

Novaco, R. W. (1985). Anger and its therapeutic regulation. In M. A. Chesney & R. H. Rosenman (Eds.), Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders (pp. 203-226). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Orenstein, P. (1994). School girls: Young women, self-esteem, and the confidence gap. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Petersen, A. (1988). Adolescent development. Annual Review of Psychology, 39, 583-607.

Piaget, J. (1981). Intelligence and affectivity. Annual Reviews Monograph, Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc. In Brody, L. (1985).

Plutchik, R. (1980). A general psychoevolutionary theory of emotion. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), Emotion: Theory, research, and experience (Vol. 1., pp. 3-33). New York: Academic Press.

Rachman, S. (1978). Fear and courage. San Francisco: Freeman.

Rogers, A., & Gilligan, C. (1988). Translating the language of adolescent girls. Themes of moral voice and stages of ego development. (Monograph No. 6). Cambridge, MA: The Center for the Study of Gender Education and Human Development, Harvard University. In L. Stern (1991). Disavowing the self in female adolescence, Women and Therapy, 11, 105-117.

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science (Vol. 3, pp. 184-256). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Romano, B. A., & Nelson, R. O. (1988). Discriminant and concurrent validity of measures of children's depression. Journal of Child Clinical Psychology, 17 (3), 255-259.

Rosaldo, M. Z. (1984). Toward an anthropology of self and feeling. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion (pp. 137-157). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Roseman, I. J. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. In P. Shaver (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 5, pp. 11-36).

Roseman, I. J., Spindel, M. S., & Jose, P. E. (1990). Appraisals of emotion-eliciting events: Testing a theory of discrete emotions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59 (5), 899-915.

Rosenthal, R., Hall, J., DiMatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. (1979). Sensitivity to nonverbal communication: The PONS test. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rutter, M. (1980). Changing youth in a changing society: Patterns of adolescent development and disorder. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rutter, M. (1986). The developmental psychopathology of depression: Issues and perspectives. In M. Rutter, C. Izzard, & P. Read (Eds.), Depression in young people: Developmental and clinical perspectives (pp. 3-30). New York: Guilford.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Schacter, S., & Singer, J. E. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 69 (5), 379-399.

Scherer, K. E. (1984). Emotion as a multicomponent process: A model and some cross-cultural data. In P. Shaver (Ed.), Review of personaliaty and social psychology (Vol. 5, pp. 37-63).

Schimmel, 42, 320-337.S. (1979). Anger and its control in Graeco-Roman and modern psychology, Psychiatry, 42, 320-337.

Seiden, A. (1989). Psychological issues affecting women throughout the life cycle. Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 12 (1), 1-24.

Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52 (6), 1061-1086.

Shennum, W. A., & Bugental, D. B. (1982). The development of control over affective expression in nonverbal behavior. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), Development of nonverbal behavior in children (pp. 101-121). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Emotion and adaptation. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 609-637). New York: Guilford.

Smith, C. A., Haynes, K. N., Lazarus, R. S., & Pope, L. K. (1993). In search of the "hot" cognitions: Attributions, appraisals, and their relation to emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65 (5), 916-929

Smucker, M. R., Craighead, W. E., Craighead, L. W., & Green, B. J. (1986). Normative and reliability data for the Children's Depression Inventory. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychiatry, 14, 25-39.

Solomon, R. C. (1976). The passions. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Sperberg, E. (1992). The effects of anger suppression and sex role orientation on depression in women college students. Unpublished manuscript, Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX.

Spicer, J., Jackson, R., & Scragg, R. (1993). The effects of anger management and social contract on risk of myocardial infarction in type As and type Bs. Psychology and Health, 8 (4),243-255.

Stearns, P. N. (1992). Gender and emotion: A twentieth-century transition. Social Perspectives on Emotion, 1, 127-160.

Steiner-Adair, C. (1986). The body politic: Normal female adolescent development and the development of eating disorders. Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 14, 95-114.

Stern, L. (1991). Disavowing the self in female adolescence. Women and Therapy, 11, (3-4), 105-117.

Strauss, C. C., Forehand, R., Frame, C., & Smith, K. (1984). Characteristics of children with extreme scores on the Children's Depression Inventory. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 13 (3), 227-231.

Street, S., & Kromrey, J. D. (1994). Differences in adjustment issues for male and female adolescents. Special Services in the Schools, 8 (2), 143-154.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton.

Tavris, C. (1989). Anger: The misunderstood emotion (rev. ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Tennant, C. C., & Langeluddecke, P. M. (1985). Psychological correlates of coronary heart disease. Psychological Medicine, 15 (3), 581-588.

Thomas, S. P. (1989). Gender differences in anger expression: Health implications. Research in Nursing and Health, 12, 389-398.

Thomas, S. P. (1990). Theoretical and empirical perspectives on women's anger, Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 11, 203-218.

Thomas, S. P. (1991). Toward a new conceptualization of women's anger. Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 12, 31-49.

Thomas, S. P. (1993). Women and anger. New York: Springer.

Thomas, S.P., & Atakan, S. (1993). Trait anger, anger expression, stress, and health status of American and Turkish midlife women. Health Care for Women International, 14, 129-143.

Thompson, C. (1942). Cultural pressures in the psychology of women. Psychiatry, 5, 331-339.

Thompson, J. M., & Hart, B. I. (1996, August). Attachment dimensions and patterns associated with silencing the self. Paper presented at the 104th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Tobin, D. L., Holroyd, K. A., & Reynolds, R. (1984). User's manual for the Coping Strategies Inventory. Ohio University, Department of Psychology, Athens, Ohio.

Tomkins, S. S. (1962). Affect, imagery, consciousness (Vol. 1). New York: Springer.

Tomkins, S. S. (1963). Affect, imagery, consciousness (Vol. 2). New York: Springer.

Tschannen, T. A., Duckro, P. N., Margolis, R. B., & Tomazic, T. J. (1992). The relationship of anger, depression, and perceived disability among headache patients. Headache, 32 (10), 501-503.

Underwood, M. K., Coie, J.D., & Herbsman, C. R. (1992). Display rules for anger and aggression in school-aged children. Child Development, 63 (2), 366-380.

Weiss, B. (1990). Developmental differences in the factor structure of the Children's Depression Inventory. Unpublished manuscript. In Crowley, et al (1994).

Weissman, M. M., & Klerman, G. L. (1977). Sex differences and the epidemiology of depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 34, 98-111.

Weissman, M.M., & Klerman, G.L. (1985). Gender and depression. Trends in Neurosciences, 8, 416-420.

Weissman, M.M., & Klerman, G.L. (1987). Gender and depression. In R. Formanek & A. Gurian (Eds.), Women and depression: A lifespan perspective (pp. 3-26). New York: Springer.

Wiggins, J. S., & Winder, C. L. (1961). The Peer Nomination Inventory: an empirically derived sociometric measure of adjustment in preadolescent boys. Psychological Reports, 9 (3), 643-677.

APPENDIX A

Pediatric Anger Expression Scale

S#_____

Pediatric Anger Expression Scale

Adapted with Permission by Gerard Jacobs, Ph.D.

	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often
1. I control my temper.	☐	☐	☐
2. I show my anger.	☐	☐	☐
3. I do things like slam doors.	☐	☐	☐
4. I keep calm.	☐	☐	☐
5. I attack whatever it is that makes me angry.	☐	☐	☐
6. I say mean things.	☐	☐	☐
7. I calm down faster than most people.	☐	☐	☐
8. I lose my temper.	☐	☐	☐
9. I tell the person I'm angry with to stop making me mad.	☐	☐	☐
10. I talk to someone until I feel better.	☐	☐	☐
11. I stop to think and don't get more angry than I already am.	☐	☐	☐
12. I do something totally different until I calm down.	☐	☐	☐
13. I try to calmly settle the problem.	☐	☐	☐
14. I hold my anger in.	☐	☐	☐
15. I get mad inside but don't show it.	☐	☐	☐

APPENDIX B

Children's Depression Inventory

CDI

Remember, describe how you have been in the past two weeks.....

Item 15
- ☐ I have to push myself all the time to do my schoolwork.
- ☐ I have to push myself many times to do my schoolwork.
- ☒ Doing schoolwork is not a big problem.

Item 16
- ☐ I have trouble sleeping every night.
- ☒ I have trouble sleeping many nights.
- ☐ I sleep pretty well.

Item 17
- ☒ I am tired once in a while.
- ☐ I am tired many days.
- ☐ I am tired all the time.

Item 18
- ☐ Most days I do not feel like eating.
- ☒ Many days I do not feel like eating.
- ☐ I eat pretty well.

Item 19
- ☒ I do not worry about aches and pains.
- ☐ I worry about aches and pains many times.
- ☐ I worry about aches and pains all the time.

Item 20
- ☐ I do not feel alone.
- ☒ I feel alone many times.
- ☐ I feel alone all the time.

Published by Multi-Health Systems, Inc., (in the United States) 908 Niagara Falls Boulevard, North Tonawanda, New York 14120-2060; (in Canada) 65 Overlea Boulevard, Suite 210, Toronto, Ontario M4H 1P1. Telephone: (800) 456-3003 (U.S.A. L(800)268-6011 (Canada), (416)424-1700 (U.S.A. or Canada).

Item 21
- ☒ I never have fun at school.
- ☐ I have fun at school only once in a while.
- ☐ I have fun at school many times.

Item 22
- ☐ I have plenty of friends.
- ☒ I have some friends but I wish I had more.
- ☐ I do not have any friends.

Item 23
- ☒ My schoolwork is alright.
- ☐ My schoolwork is not as good as before.
- ☐ I do very badly in subjects I used to be good in

Item 24
- ☒ I can never be as good as other kids.
- ☐ I can be as good as other kids if I want to.
- ☐ I am just as good as other kids.

Item 25
- ☐ Nobody really loves me.
- ☒ I am not sure if anybody loves me.
- ☐ I am sure that somebody loves me.

Item 26
- ☒ I usually do what I am told.
- ☐ I do not do what I am told most times.
- ☐ I never do what I am told.

Item 27
- ☒ I get along with people.
- ☐ I get into fights many times.
- ☐ I get into fights all the time.

MHS

Remember to fill out the other side

CDI

Item 1
- [x] I am sad once in a while.
- [ ] I am sad many times.
- [ ] I am sad all the time.

Item 2
- [ ] Nothing will ever work out for me.
- [x] I am not sure if things will work out for me.
- [ ] Things will work out for me O.K.

Item 3
- [ ] I do most things O.K.
- [x] I do many things wrong.
- [ ] I do everything wrong.

Item 4
- [ ] I have fun in many things.
- [x] I have fun in some things.
- [ ] Nothing is fun at all.

Item 5
- [ ] I am bad all the time.
- [ ] I am bad many times.
- [x] I am bad once in a while.

Item 6
- [ ] I think about bad things happening to me once in a while.
- [x] I worry that bad things will happen to me.
- [ ] I am sure that terrible things will happen to me.

Item 7
- [ ] I hate myself.
- [x] I do not like myself.
- [ ] I like myself.

Item 8
- [ ] All bad things are my fault.
- [x] Many bad things are my fault.
- [ ] Bad things are not usually my fault.

Item 9
- [x] I do not think about killing myself.
- [ ] I think about killing myself but I would not do it.
- [ ] I want to kill myself.

Item 10
- [ ] I feel like crying every day.
- [x] I feel like crying many days.
- [ ] I feel like crying once in a while.

Item 11
- [ ] Things bother me all the time.
- [ ] Things bother me many times.
- [x] Things bother me once in a while.

Item 12
- [ ] I like being with people.
- [x] I do not like being with people many times.
- [ ] I do not want to be with people at all.

Item 13
- [x] I cannot make up my mind about things.
- [ ] It is hard to make up my mind about things.
- [ ] I make up my mind about things easily.

Item 14
- [ ] I look O.K.
- [x] There are some bad things about my looks.
- [ ] I look ugly.

Remember to fill out the other side

APPENDIX C

Cover Letters and Consent Forms

Dear Parent,

I am a psychology intern, serving DISD in your child's school. Currently, I'm conducting a study to learn more about children's emotional development and the ways they handle anger. I want to contribute to our knowledge so that all children and adolescents will be better served by psychologists, counselors and teachers in the future.

With your permission, I hope to involve your child in my project. This involves their completing two short questionnaires provided by myself, at the school. One deals with anger and the other with depression or sadness. Both questionnaires together should take about 20 minutes to complete, and I'll work closely with classroom teachers to find the best testing times to protect children's daily academic routines.

Should you decide to participate, your child's anonymity and confidentiality will be carefully protected. Each child's responses on both questionnaires will be marked by a number (no names) and only the investigator will have a master list of names and assigned numbers. After the results are analyzed, this master list will be destroyed and no child's identity will be available. Your involvement is completely voluntary. Any participating parent or child can leave the project at any time.

Since I work in your child's school weekly, I'll be on hand to answer any questions or handle any issues that may arise as a result of the project. Please feel free to contact me anytime at the number given below should you have questions or concerns. If you agree with your child's taking part in my project, please sign both of the enclosed forms, keep one for yourself, and return the other to your child's teacher. Thank you so much for your time and help with my study!

Sincerely,

Deborah L. Brockman, M.A., psychology intern
(214) 743-0705

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
SUBJECT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

"Anger suppression as a vehicle for gender socialization in girls: A developmental study."

Conducted by Deborah L. Brockman, M.A.
(214) 743-0705

My signature on this form represents my understanding of the following:

I am giving voluntary permission for my child to participate in a study on emotional development, involving the completion of two questionnaires, requiring about 20 minutes' time. This will be done at school, in cooperation with my child's classroom teacher. I and my child have the right to withdraw from the project at any time, without any penalty or loss of benefit to which we're otherwise entitled. Our confidentiality and anonymity will be carefully protected. Forms will be stored at the investigator's home only long enough to complete the analysis of results (approximately two weeks), at which time they will be shredded by the investigator.

Although participation in this study requires only filling out paper-and-pencil forms about anger and depression, some concerns or issues may arise as a result. Children participating may have questions or strong feelings about the items on the tests, and may wish to talk about them. The investigator, Deborah Brockman, will be available in the school to answer questions or talk to any children or parents with questions or concerns. Additionally, I may reach Ms. Brockman at any time via voicemail-paging system should I wish to talk about the study.

Results of this study will be sent to me, should I request them. Findings will add to our knowledge about children's emotional development and help psychologists, counselors, and teachers to better serve children. They may also help parents better understand how their children develop emotionally and deal with strong feelings, like anger.

_____ _____

Parent or legal guardian of participating student. Date

_____ _____

Student Date

We will try to prevent any problem that could happen because of this research. Please let us know at once if there is a problem and we will help you. You should understand, however, that TWU does not provide medical services or financial assistance for injuries that might happen because you are taking part in this research.

If you have any questions about the research or about your rights as a subject, we want you to ask us. Ourphone number is at the top of this form. If you have questions later, or if you wish to report a problem,please call us or the Office of Research & Grants Administration at 817-898-3375.

Dear Parent,

I am a psychology intern, serving DISD in your child's school. Currently, I'm conducting a study to learn more about children's emotional development and the ways they handle anger. I want to contribute to our knowledge so that all children and adolescents will be better served by psychologists, counselors and teachers in the future.

With your permission, I hope to involve your child in my project. This involves their participation in a group discussion with three other girls of the same age, attended only by myself or my representative. The group discussion will be about the feeling of anger and will be tape-recorded to allow me to record and interpret girls' responses to questions about anger. I'll work closely with classroom teachers to find the best time for our discussion to protect the girls' daily academic routines.

Should you decide to participate, your child's anonymity and confidentiality will be carefully protected. Each girl's responses to questions will be transcribed and identified using only a false name of her choice. After the results are interpreted, the tape-recording will be destroyed and no girl's identity will be available. Your involvement is completely voluntary. Any participating parent or student can leave the project at any time.

Since I work in your child's school weekly, I'll be on hand to answer any questions or handle any issues that may arise as a result of the project. Please feel free to contact me anytime at the number given below should you have questions or concerns. If you agree with your child's taking part in my project, please sign both of the enclosed forms, keep one for yourself, and return the other to your child's teacher. Thank you so much for your time and help with my study!

Sincerely,

Deborah L. Brockman, M.A., psychology intern

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
SUBJECT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

"Anger Suppression as a Vehicle for Gender Socialization in Girls: A Developmental Study"

Conducted by
Deborah L. Brockman, M.A.
(214) 743-0705

My signature on this form constitutes my understanding of the following:

I am giving permission for my child to participate in a study on emotional development, involving her taking part in a group discussion with three other girls of her same age, at her school. The session will take approximately 45 minutes and will be attended only by the investigator or a representative thereof. This group discussion will be about the feeling of anger and will be audiotaped to allow the investigator to later record responses to questions. Any tape-recorded information will be stored in the home of the investigator, who will have sole access to its contents. The material will be kept only long enough to permit interpretation of girls' responses (about three to four weeks) and will then be incinerated by the investigator.

My child's confidentiality and anonymity will be carefully protected, as will our right to withdraw from participation at any time during the course of the project. No penalty or loss of benefit otherwise entitled us will occur as a result of our refusal to participate in this study. Care will be taken to minimize disruption in my child's regular academic routine as she participates.

Although risks involved in participation are small, participating students may have strong feelings, concerns or questions arising as a result of the discussion. The investigator will be available in the school to answer questions or handle issues that may arise, and may be reached at any time via voicemail-paging system at the number above, should I or my child wish to reach her.

This study will add to our current knowledge about children's emotional development and help psychologists, counselors, and teachers better serve them. It will also help parents to better understand how their children deal with strong feelings, like anger. A copy of the results will be sent to me, should I request it.

_____ _____

Parent of legal guardian of student. Date

_____ _____

Participating student. Date

We will try to prevent any problem that could happen because of this research. Please let us know at once if there is a problem and we will help you. You should understand, however, that TWU does not provide medical services or financial assistance for injuries that might happen because you are taking part in this research.

If you have any questions about the research or about your rights as a subject, we want you to ask us. Our phone number is at the top of this form. If you have questions later, or if you wish to report a problem, please call us or the Office of Research & Grants Administration at 817-898-3375.

APPENDIX D

Figures Summarizing Additional Qualitative Response Data: Behaviors, Feelings, Opinions of Those Perceiving Angry Boys and Girls

Figure 1

Frequencies of Behaviors of Others as Perceived by Girls

Girls Perceiving Angry Girls	Girls Perceiving Angry Boys	Boys Perceiving Angry Girls	Boys Perceiving Angry Boys	Moms Perceiving Angry Girls
SP (2)	RD (1)	RS (1)	RS (1)	EN (2)
RS (1)	DS (3)	EX (1)	DS (1)	SP (2)
EX (1)	AG (1)	RD (2)	AG (2)	RS (1)
DM (1)		DM (1)	VA (1)	EX (1)
DS (1)		DS (6)		DS (1)
JD (1)		IG (1)		JD (1)
AG (1)		PT (2)		PT (2)
VA (1)		AG (3)		PN (6)
		VA (2)		AG (4)
				VA (3)
				CT (2)

EN - Explaining
CO - Coaching
TE - Teaching
RD - Ridiculing
DM - Diminishing
JD - Judging
PT - Pathologizing
PN - Punishing
AG - Aggressing
VA - Verbal Aggression
ST - Stifling
CT - Controlling
SP - Supporting
LY - Leniency
RS - Respecting
EX - Exploring
DS - Distancing
IG - Ignoring

Figure 1 (Cont'd.)

Frequencies of Behaviors of Others as Perceived by Girls

Moms Perceiving Angry Boys	Dads Perceiving Angry Girls	Dads Perceiving Angry Boys	Teachers Perceiving Angry Girls	Teachers Perceiving Angry Boys
EN (1)	TE (1)	CO (4)	TE (1)	LY (2)
TE (1)	SP (2)	LY (2)	SP (3)	DS (3)
SP (4)	LY (2)	PN (2)	LY (1)	IG (1)
LY (4)	EX (1)	AG (1)	DM (2)	PN (2)
RS (1)	DM (2)		PN (1)	CT (1)
EX (1)	DS (8)		CT (1)	
RD (1)	PN (3)			
DS (2)				
PN (2)				
AG (1)				
ST (1)				

EN - Explaining
CO - Coaching
TE - Teaching
RD - Ridiculing
DM - Diminishing
JD - Judging
PT - Pathologizing
PN - Punishing
AG - Aggressing
VA - Verbal Aggression
ST - Stifling
CT - Controlling
SP - Supporting
LY - Leniency
RS - Respecting
EX - Exploring
DS - Distancing
IG - Ignoring

Figure 2

Frequencies of Opinions of Others as Perceived by Girls

Girls Perceiving Angry Girls	Girls Perceiving Angry Boys	Boys Perceiving Angry Girls	Boys Perceiving Angry Boys	Moms Perceiving Angry Girls
Angry Person as Coward (2)	Angry Person as Coward (1)	Angry Person as Coward (4)	Angry Person as Coward (1)	
Angry Person as Self-Aggrandizing (8)	Angry Person as Self-Aggrandizing (1)	Angry Person as Self-Aggrandizing (1)		
	Angry Person as Stupid (2)	Angry Person as Crazy (2)		
		Angry Person as Petty (1)		
		Angry Person as Mean (1)		

Figure 2 (Cont'd.)

Frequencies of Opinions of Others as Perceived by Girls

Moms Perceiving Angry Boys	Dads Perceiving Angry Girls	Dads Perceiving Angry Boys	Teachers Perceiving Angry Girls	Teachers Perceiving Angry Boys
	Angry Person as Over-Dramatizing (2)		Angry Person as Petty (2)	

Figure 3

Frequencies of Feelings of Others as Perceived by Girls

Girls Perceiving Angry Girls	**Girls Perceiving Angry Boys**	**Boys Perceiving Angry Girls**	**Boys Perceiving Angry Boys**	**Moms Perceiving Angry Girls**
Sadness (1)	Fear (3)	Fear (2)	Neutrality (1)	Anger (7)
Neutrality (1)	Amusement (1)	Confusion (1)	Fear (1)	Neutrality (1)
Anger (1)		Neutrality (1)		Sadness (1)

Figure 3 (Cont'd.)

Frequencies of Feelings of Others as Perceived by Girls

Moms Perceiving Angry Boys	**Dads Perceiving Angry Girls**	**Dads Perceiving Angry Boys**	**Teachers Perceiving Angry Girls**	**Teachers Perceiving Angry Boys**
Fear (3)	Concern (2)	Sadness (1)	Concern (2)	Neutrality (1)
Anger (2)	Pity (1)	Neutrality (1)	Neutrality (1)	Fear (1)
Neutrality (2)	Amusement (1)	Anger (1)	Guilt (1)	
Sadness (1)	Neutrality (1)		Anger (1)	
Pity (1)	Confusion (1)			
	Hopelessness/ Inept (1)			